

The JOURNAL of
S. W. Higginbotham
SOUTHERN
HISTORY

VOL. VIII

NOVEMBER, 1942

No. 4



Published quarterly by the
SOUTHERN HISTORICAL ASSOCIATION

The Journal of Southern History

VOLUME VIII

NOVEMBER, 1942

NUMBER 4

Published Quarterly by
THE SOUTHERN HISTORICAL ASSOCIATION

BOARD OF EDITORS

WALTER B. POSEY
Birmingham-Southern College

ROBERT S. COTTERILL
Florida State College for Women

PAUL H. BUCK
Harvard University

FLETCHER M. GREEN
University of North Carolina

W. NEIL FRANKLIN
The National Archives

ROBERT H. WOODY
Duke University

ELLA LONN
Goucher College

BELL I. WILEY
University of Mississippi

MANAGING EDITOR

FRED C. COLE, Louisiana State University

EDITORIAL ASSOCIATE

WENDELL H. STEPHENSON, Louisiana State University

GUARANTOR

LOUISIANA STATE UNIVERSITY

Correspondence in regard to contributions to the *Journal* should be sent to the Managing Editor, Louisiana State University, University Station, Baton Rouge, Louisiana.

The Southern Historical Association supplies the *Journal* to its members. The annual membership fee is three dollars; upon payment of fifty dollars, any person may become a life member. Single numbers of the *Journal* are available at seventy-five cents. Membership applications and checks should be sent to the Secretary-Treasurer.

The Southern Historical Association disclaims responsibility for statements made by contributors.

Entered as second-class matter April 5, 1935, at the Post Office at University Station, Baton Rouge, Louisiana, under the Act of August 24, 1912.

The Journal of Southern History

VOLUME VIII NOVEMBER, 1942 NUMBER 4



CONTENTS

<i>The South and Its History.</i> By William O. Lynch.....	465
<i>The Virginia-Chickasaw Treaty of 1783.</i> By Robert S. Cotterill	483
<i>The Grange and Farmer Education in Mississippi.</i> By James S. Ferguson..	497
<i>Was Plantation Slavery Profitable?</i> By Thomas P. Govan.....	513
<i>The Reunion of Two Virginia Counties.</i> By Susie M. Ames.....	536
<i>Notes and Documents</i>	
The Journal of William Moultrie While a Commissioner on the North and South Carolina Boundary Survey, 1772. Edited by Charles S. Davis....	549
A Civil War Secret Service Code. Edited by John G. Westover.....	556
<i>Book Reviews</i>	
Wertenbaker, <i>The Old South. The Founding of American Civilization</i> , by Charles S. Sydnor.....	558
Stock (ed.), <i>Proceedings and Debates of the British Parliaments respecting North America</i> , by Philip Davidson.....	559
Taylor, <i>Ante-Bellum South Carolina. A Social and Cultural History</i> , by C. S. Boucher	560
Padover, <i>Jefferson</i> , by Thomas P. Abernethy	561
Bondurant, <i>Poe's Richmond</i> , by Guy A. Cardwell, Jr.....	562
Clark, <i>The Tennessee Yeoman, 1840-1860</i> , by Ralph B. Flanders.....	562
Craven, <i>The Coming of the Civil War</i> , by Fletcher M. Green.....	564
Sensing, <i>Champ Ferguson, Confederate Guerilla</i> , by James W. Silver.....	565
Dyson, <i>Howard University, The Capstone of Negro Education. A History:1867- 1940</i> , by H. L. Swint.....	566
Ellis, <i>Mr. Dooley's America. A Life of Finley Peter Dunne</i> , by William B. Hatcher.....	568
Pope, <i>Millhands & Preachers. A Study of Gastonia</i> , by Lester J. Cappon.....	569
Hinton, <i>Cordell Hull, A Biography</i> , by George C. Osborn.....	570
Historical Records Survey, <i>Guide to the Manuscript Collections in the Archives of the North Carolina Historical Commission</i> , by William J. Van Schreeven	571
<i>Communications</i>	
Paul M. Angle.....	572
M. Swearingen.....	573
<i>Historical News and Notices</i>	
Personal	574
Historical Societies.....	578
Bibliographical	579
<i>Contributors</i>	593

The South and Its History

BY WILLIAM O. LYNCH

At a critical juncture in its history, the South almost became an independent nation.¹ Missouri, Kentucky, Maryland, Delaware, and what became West Virginia did not join the Confederate States of America, but this borderland belt contributed heavily to the cause of the Confederacy as well as to that of the Union. In various portions of the eleven states that sought independence, there were populations that were little interested in the fortunes of either side and who participated in the conflict mainly from necessity. There were elements in the non-slaveholding states that sympathized with the South. Indeed, it has always been and is yet difficult to delimit the South. That it begins on the Atlantic coast and extends to and along the Gulf of Mexico to the Rio Grande is evident. There is, however, no natural line across the tide-water, the piedmont plateau, or the Appalachians to separate North from South. The Ohio River presents a tangible line, but the arms of a river reach out both ways and unite rather than divide, as peoples have learned again and again in the course of history. Across the Mississippi, there is the 36° 30' line, but only a tiny patch of Missouri lies below it. To the westward, the older South, in its advance, extended to and into the great plains, a region with diverging climate, soil, and topography, but no definite boundary line was discovered.

North and South share the Atlantic area, the Appalachians, and the Mississippi Valley, a fundamental fact that worked in opposition to

¹ This paper was read before the annual meeting of the Southern Historical Association at Atlanta, Georgia, November 7, 1941.

separate nationality for the South. Nevertheless, southern nationalism developed into a powerful force, and there is still a South though it is a part of the United States. Geographic factors have worked both ways, which explains some of the complexity of southern history. There is an Upper South and a Lower South, but the natural features run counter to this division, as every student of southern history knows. Climate, with emphasis on temperature rather than rainfall, has done more, perhaps, than any other single factor to mold the South. The varying length and severity of the summers and winters have, along with soils, determined the areas of the staple crops. These crops, in turn, have deeply influenced southern economic, social, and political development. The fact that tobacco, though grown by both small and large producers, lent itself to plantations and slave labor somewhat as did rice, caused the tidewater country of the Upper and Lower South to have some common trends in the colonial period. In the same way tobacco and cotton later brought about a degree of common understanding, both in the Atlantic and western areas.

The southern Appalachians reach into the heart of the Deep South. The ranges of this system trend westward as much as southward, and sloping away from them to low country are plateaus on the east, the south, and the west. The Appalachians thus extend into the South like a vast peninsula. The Appalachian Valley occupies a position between the main ranges, most of its southern portion lying in Virginia and Tennessee. In Virginia, the greater part of the Valley is located between the Blue Ridge and the Alleghenies, but it is bordered by the Great Smokies and the Cumberlands as it continues its southwestward trend. In ante-bellum days the southern Appalachians stood out as a region that was alien to the rest of the South, constituting a factor quite hostile to southern unity. In the era of the New South this extensive mountain peninsula with its transportation system and its exchange of products with surrounding areas has become an integrating force. Supplementing the railway lines, modern paved roads come into the mountain country from every direction. The beauty, the healthfulness, and the wealth of the southern highlands are every year known to and ap-

preciated by more and more Southerners, and the same may be said of Northerners.

That part of the South lying east of the Appalachians is made up of the tidewater belt and piedmont plateau. The lowland country that fronts on the Gulf corresponds to the eastern tidewater, and the plateau that slopes southward from the mountains is a continuation of the piedmont. The Cumberland Plateau of Kentucky, Tennessee, and northern Alabama is the counterpart of the piedmont lying east of the mountains, while the country along the lower Ohio and down the Mississippi on both sides is a lowland belt that borders the Cumberland Plateau as the tidewater belt of the eastern area does the piedmont. It was in these areas surrounding Appalachia that the Old South developed, and a knowledge of the three large connected regions, east, south, and west of the southern mountains, is essential to an understanding of the history of the South.

The rainfall of the first of these three regions finds its way to the Atlantic. Some of the streams drain portions of the tidewater only, some rise in the midst of the piedmont, and others flow down from the mountains. Below the fall line the rivers furnished a ready-made system of transportation and travel to the colonists who settled along their courses. The streams that crossed the piedmont, however, served that area but poorly in these respects, which stimulated the founding and growth of the fall-line towns and presented the first occupants of the country above the falls with a road problem. The North Branch of the Potomac rises on the Allegheny Plateau and cuts through the Allegheny Front before it joins the South Branch to form the Potomac, which then crosses the Valley to flow directly through the Blue Ridge on the way to Chesapeake Bay. The Potomac, in fact, performs strange feats that can be explained only by the assumption that the river is older than the mountains. No other southern river flowing towards the Atlantic drains any part of the Allegheny Plateau, but two others, the James and the Roanoke, flow through the Blue Ridge. The James rises on the Allegheny Escarpment, meanders across the Appalachian Valley, and passes through a gap in the Blue Ridge. The Roanoke, which also accomplishes the

last feat, drains but a small portion of the Appalachian Valley. The other large rivers of Virginia, the Carolinas, and Georgia that contribute their waters to the Atlantic rise on the Blue Ridge, except where their sources are found in the piedmont. This fact gives great importance to the three water gaps of the Blue Ridge that are occupied by the Potomac, the James, and the Roanoke.

The country south of the Appalachians is naturally drained into the Gulf of Mexico. The Chattahoochee reaches far up into the mountains as do the head streams that feed the Alabama River. These rivers and the Tombigbee are comparable to the larger rivers of the Atlantic area. The Sabine, the Rio Grande, and the Texas rivers between them are of historic significance, but, as carriers of water, those west of the Sabine give about as much trouble to man from low water as from floods.

The Mississippi drains but a small portion of the Lower South, and nearly all of this limited area lies west of the great river. To the northward the Missouri is balanced by the Ohio, but below the Ohio there are no eastern tributaries to match the Arkansas and the Red. The Cumberland River, rising in eastern Kentucky on the western slope of the Cumberland Front, winds down the plateau towards the Mississippi and should discharge into that great artery at Memphis or not far below it. Instead, it is deflected towards the northwest and finds its way to the Ohio. The Tennessee River is formed by the junction of the French Broad and the Holston in East Tennessee. When it crosses the Tennessee-Alabama line to flow on towards the southwest parallel to Lookout Mountain, it has already gathered up the waters of the Appalachian Valley of southwestern Virginia and East Tennessee and those of the high plateau of western North Carolina between the Blue Ridge and the Great Smokies. The Tennessee should flow on to the Mississippi, or, if not, along the path of least resistance directly to the Gulf, but it deserts these natural lines, turns westward, then northward, and discharges into the Ohio a very few miles below the mouth of the Cumberland. To follow this course the Tennessee must cut through the ridges west of and parallel to Lookout Mountain, performing a freak feat such as is repeated by few of the earth's rivers. By their peculiar courses the Cum-

berland and the Tennessee have exerted a marked influence on the history of the South. No one can deny that these rivers fought for the Union and against the Confederacy during the South's struggle for independence.

Southwest of the upper Roanoke, the Appalachian Valley lies mainly in the area drained by the Tennessee and contributing streams, but not all of it. The New-Kanawha River follows an unusual course. It does not flow eastward across the Valley like the Potomac and the James, nor rise in it and flow out through the Blue Ridge as does the Roanoke. It does not rise in the Valley and remain in it as do the Shenandoah, the Clinch, and the forks of the Holston to flow parallel to the ridges. Unlike all of the other streams of the southern Appalachians, the New River, rising on the Blue Ridge, flows first along the west side of that Ridge in a northeasterly direction, then turns to flow across the Valley directly towards the Allegheny Front. Breaking through, it takes an adventurous and difficult course down the Allegheny Plateau. On the way to the Ohio at Kanawha Falls (not at the junction of any stream with the New), the New becomes the Kanawha. The floor of the Appalachian Valley is high where the New crosses it, and it is but a little way on the one side to the source of the Roanoke and the sources of little streams that reach the James, and on the other side but a short distance to the sources of the Clinch and of the forks of the Holston. As one travels up or down this too little-known New River—along its upper course, as it winds across the Valley, as it cuts through the Allegheny Escarpment at the Narrows, or as it occupies a canyon of the Allegheny Plateau—he feels that he is privileged to view some of the finest scenery in America.

The passes, both wind gaps and water gaps, of the southern Appalachians, the Appalachian Valley, and the rivers of the region all influenced to a marked degree the westward flow of colonists from tide-water and piedmont. Towns and cities grew up at strategic points on the natural routes. The highways that now thread the vast mountain peninsula of the South follow approximately the first trails. These routes made difficult and tortuous by reason of formidable barriers,

nevertheless, originally ran along lines of least resistance that explorers, traders, and colonists sought out. Thousands of people who today dwell in those portions of the United States that lie west of Appalachia can find chapters in the histories of their families relating to the passage of the mountain peninsula of the South by their ancestors.²

Topography, soils, rivers, and river valleys have been no more important than temperatures, which have exerted an especially potent influence in southern history. Cotton, which in time became the foremost product of the South and of the country as a whole, owed a great deal to the fact that in the Lower South a long period intervenes between the end of one winter and the beginning of the next. Some areas where cotton was grown when the prices were steadily high in the early period, dropped the production of the crop when a long era of low prices ensued. The risk of crop losses in summers when the growing season was too short could be borne when prices were quite certain to be high, but not in a period when prices were quite sure to be low. An examination of cotton production in Virginia before 1830 in contrast with the following thirty years will illustrate the fundamental importance of the long growing season for cotton. Seed selection and the use of commercial fertilizer have brought cotton into areas of the older South where little or none was grown before 1860. The higher lands of Georgia furnish an interesting example of the influence of the shortening of the time necessary to make a cotton crop. The fine cotton fields that are found in the bottom lands in the country about Cairo, Illinois, show the influence of unusually rich soils in decreasing the length of the period between the planting and picking of cotton. The safe general rule of the ante-bellum period was, nevertheless, that cotton should be confined to those parts of the South where it was pretty certain that

² In this necessarily brief treatment of the South as a region, the thought has been that history cannot be separated from geography. It is believed, therefore, that it is essential to understand the South as a geographic area before attempting to interpret or summarize its history. For a number of years, the author has through personal observation attempted to become acquainted with the main features of southern geography. While the above discussion is mainly based on firsthand information, acknowledgment of indebtedness to all who have published studies on southern geography is gratefully made.

there would be two hundred days between the last spring frost and the first of autumn.³

It is well known that Virginians were reluctant to resort to Negro slavery as a solution of the labor problem, and there was an absence of planning in the evolution of the labor system of the plantations in the tobacco area of the colonial period. In the rice area the slave-labor system came into being much more readily, was borrowed from Barbados and influenced by the Spanish system which the British found in Jamaica. Fundamentally, the increase of slaves in the southern colonies was due to the fact that the principal crops lent themselves to large-scale production and to the further fact that, in a new country, there was no other way to solve the labor problem involved in extensive production. It was not a matter of Nordics or Latins, nor was it a matter in which religion or morals were much involved. The coming of cotton culture in the upper tidewater and piedmont, and its later expansion westward while tobacco culture spread to a new region of the Upper South, caused the slave-labor system to move westward—a natural development, impassioned, dramatic contests and “sacred” compromises notwithstanding. In another respect it was natural that slave laborers should be carried westward. Men with little or no property who lived in areas of the older North that became populous tended to migrate to the West. When the slaves of any part of the older South became too numerous in relation to the need for their services, they could not voluntarily migrate to some frontier zone, but they could be carried westward by planters, or sold to slave traders who transported them to new territories or states where their labor was in demand. The transference of slaves from older to newer areas, the same as the westward march of free Southerners with limited means, was a necessary parallel to the movement of poorer elements of freemen from older to newer areas in the North. Other things being equal, a slave was better off in a new area

³ It was not until after 1794 that cotton was extensively grown in the South. Then, Southerners, influenced by a group of factors including large areas with suitable soil and climatic conditions, the availability of an adequate labor supply, and a great market, produced cotton on a grand scale. To a marked degree this determined the course of southern history.

where his master could own him to advantage, than in an old area where he was an economic liability.⁴

Aside from the carrying of slaves to virgin country, the westward movement in the South was very similar to that of the North. Colonists left older, more crowded areas for the wide open spaces of one frontier zone after another, and this occupation of the vast country west of the Appalachians during the nineteenth century is one of the most significant features of American history. The colonizing power of several of the old thirteen commonwealths was truly remarkable. The old southern states that shared extensively in the peopling of a vast new region and building a civilization where none had ever existed before were Virginia, North Carolina, South Carolina, and Georgia. New states were admitted into the Union between 1789 and 1861 with populations ranging from slightly under 60,000 to slightly over 100,000. Between these dates enough colonists went out from Virginia alone to have added at least five new states, while North Carolinians could have added three and South Carolinians two. Georgia, though a large state, had but a small population in 1790, and, as late as 1850, included a number of free persons born outside of the state equal to the number of free Georgians living elsewhere in the United States. That the inflow was equal to the outflow, as late as 1850 in the case of Georgia, was only slightly due to industrial or commercial development, the explanation being that the state matured much later than the Carolinas or Virginia.

Colonists leaving South Carolina moved mainly westward, comparatively few of them finding their way into the newer areas of the Upper South, with an insignificant number migrating to the Old Northwest. In contrast, Virginia sent far larger contingents to the country north of the Ohio than to the country south of the Tennessee. North Carolina, like Virginia, helped to people the Old Northwest, Kentucky, Tennessee,

⁴ One of the tragic truths relative to the violent controversies that preceded the Civil War is that bitter charges and countercharges were not based on evidence patiently collected and carefully considered. The result was that many facts, conditions, and developments that were entirely natural could not be understood by northern and southern extremists along with hosts of others who came under their influence. Ascertainable information was either not obtained or only partially obtained.

and Missouri, but did far more than the Old Dominion in the colonization of the Lower South west of Georgia. The large part played by Virginia, North Carolina, Kentucky, and Tennessee in colonizing areas north of the Ohio and Missouri meant much in American history. Before the Revolutionary War there was a notable movement from Pennsylvania into the Shenandoah Valley and into the piedmont of Virginia and the Carolinas. In the period from 1790 to 1850 there were few colonists from any of the older states of the North who found their way into any part of the South to offset the large flow of Southerners into new northern areas. There seems, however, to be no good basis for the old contention that poorer families of the North and foreign immigrants would not go into southern areas on account of slavery. Both Northerners and foreigners poured into Missouri in great numbers, especially from 1850 to 1860. Climatic conditions had far more influence than slavery on the search for new homes by westward-moving colonists. Not many individuals or families would migrate to areas with longer and more severe winters than those to which they were accustomed, nor to areas with longer and hotter summers than those with which they were familiar. Colonists were prone to go where they would not be subjected to seasons obnoxious to them, and where, if engaged in farming, they would not have to learn to produce new crops or even old crops in new ways. It is not easy to prove that the movement of colonists to new areas would have been essentially different in either North or South if there had been no slaves in the United States.⁵

The great demand for raw cotton that came as a result of the invention of spinning and weaving machinery that could be operated by water or steam power, affected profoundly the course of southern history. On the lands of the upper tidewater and piedmont, because the climatic and soil conditions were suited to upland cotton, there were great possibilities, though very little was grown until after the inven-

⁵ Two statements have been so often made and so long accepted that it is difficult to combat them, though both are largely erroneous. One is that northern colonists and incoming foreigners who sought homes in new areas would not go where slaves were held; the other is that southern colonists who migrated to new nonslaveholding areas did so to get away from slavery. There is some truth in each statement, but other factors determined the courses followed by most migrating families or individuals.

tion of the cotton gin. Immediately afterwards, however, the great expansion began. Slaves were brought in mainly from the old tobacco area and the whole region was transformed. Many farms were converted into plantations, and the wealth and importance of the region rapidly increased. This was especially true of interior South Carolina and Georgia, the first mighty cotton country of the United States. As enterprising farmers bought out their neighbors and acquired slaves, and newcomers from the tidewater with slaves bought up cotton lands, the westward movement was given stimulus. Locally, the free population in normal counties receded for many years as land units tended to become larger and the slave population greater. The dominant class became tolerant of slavery and more ready to defend the institution. Planters, along with the lawyers, bankers, merchants, and others whose prosperity depended upon the planters, became more conservative. Political leaders with well-defined beliefs and policies, of whom John C. Calhoun was a shining example, took on different views and became champions of a different program.⁶

Before the older cotton country reached its climax, a second cotton region, which was in a few years to eclipse the first, began to develop rapidly. A new southern tobacco district likewise appeared in Kentucky, Middle Tennessee, and Missouri, which new area was soon producing enough of that commodity on virgin soils to add to the economic distress of the older tobacco country where planters had long been struggling along under hard conditions.

Southern planters and farmers had not worried much about protective tariff schedules during years of prosperity, but hard times often make big issues out of policies that have not been previously questioned. A bitter opposition with a sound basis arose against protective duties, and Vice-President Calhoun killed the tariff measure of 1827 by his casting vote. This action did not accord with the tariff speech of 1816

⁶ The Calhoun family was caught in the transformation of the South Carolina piedmont from a frontier farming region to a cotton growing country, and the important changes in the views of John C. Calhoun between 1816 and 1831 were largely due to this fact. Frederick J. Turner once pointed out that here was the "clew" to Calhoun's career. *The Rise of the New West, 1819-1829* (New York, 1906), 183.

made by this statesman when he was an ardent champion of any policy that would bind East and West into a stronger union. He did not fail in the defense of his change to give a fundamental reason for his new stand. He now stated that he had discovered that a policy which once made for unity was producing deep antagonism between the great geographic interests of the country. It was a mark of Calhoun's strength that whether his remedies were sound or not, he could very generally discover the ills that existed in reference to both domestic and foreign conditions.⁷

It is well known that other South Carolina leaders preceded Calhoun in the advocacy of nullification as a remedy for alleged unconstitutional procedure by Congress, and also that leaders of other states, North, West, and South, antedated his state in expressing a belief in the theory of nullification. Calhoun simply stands out as the champion of the doctrine and process in its finished form. It will never cease to be interesting that the man who became the greatest of nullifiers by 1832 had, back in 1817, declared: "I am no advocate for refined arguments on the Constitution. The instrument was not intended as a thesis for the logician to exercise his ingenuity on." To this he added that "it ought to be construed with plain good sense." It should be stated at once that while he was not the first logician to exercise his ingenuity on the Constitution, neither was he nor Jefferson Davis to be the last to conjure with the provisions of that great document. While seeking a permanent constitutional method by which a minority might protect itself from legislation of doubtful constitutionality sponsored by selfish interests, it seems that Calhoun should also have centered his powerful mind on the disastrous effects of agricultural production without any semblance of plan. It would seem to a disinterested onlooker that an AAA program

⁷ An essay could be written on the many-sided Calhoun. He became the foremost champion of nullification and a very few years later an outstanding defender of the institution of African slavery as it had developed in the South. The emphasis bestowed on his positions relative to these highly controversial issues has obscured the many other interests and activities that marked his public career. Because of his stand on the great issues mentioned, he did not lose his interest in internal transportation, banking and currency, the westward movement, and foreign relations. It is unfortunate that his prominence in regard to nullification and slavery has caused his deep and continuing interest in other issues to be so seriously ignored.

applied to both cotton and tobacco would have been an enlightened policy from 1825 to the Civil War, to say nothing of other periods. Surely Calhoun could have made a name for himself by advocating control of crop production in the period of the nullification contest. When the ill grace with which a considerable proportion of producers of crops accept control of output today is considered, it is difficult to censure Calhoun and the other political leaders of his day and generation for not urging a resort to agricultural planning. It remains true without doubt that the competition growing out of the swift growth of a new and vast cotton area and a new tobacco district affected the prosperity of older plantation areas to a far greater extent than did the tariff system of the period of the South Carolina nullification crisis.⁸

The South shared in the great expansion of the middle period of American history. New southern states were formed and added to the Union as rapidly as were new northern states. The total population of the South was 7,246,891 in 1830; in 1860 it was 11,485,725. The number of slaves increased from a little above 2,000,000 to a little under 4,000,000 in the same three decades. The last decade before the clash of arms was one of greater prosperity than the two that immediately preceded. The world demand for southern products increased tremendously. Cotton prices of the 1850's did not compare with those of the 1820's but were quite steady and better than those of the 1840's. The area made up of Mississippi, Alabama, Louisiana, Texas, and Arkansas was producing more than two and a half times as much cotton by 1860 as in 1850. The older cotton area naturally did not show such an extreme gain, but the increase was notable, especially in Georgia. The important cotton states each handled from 50,000 to 700,000 more bales a year at the end of the decade than at the beginning. Kentucky, first in

⁸ The contention here is simply that the political leaders of the South who championed nullification as a remedy for southern economic ills did not properly consider the marked effect of the unregulated production of cotton in a new area on a vast scale in competition with the older cotton area of the upper tidewater and piedmont. Likewise the rise of the new tobacco area of Kentucky, Tennessee, and Missouri played greater havoc with the fortunes of struggling tobacco producers in Virginia, North Carolina, and Maryland than did any other factor. Whatever was understood by others relative to the effects of disastrous competition of new cotton and tobacco producing areas on the older sections, the outstanding political leaders ignored it and stressed other causes of economic evils.

tobacco production in the new tobacco area of the South, reported 108,126,840 pounds in 1860 (crop of 1859) as against 55,501,196 pounds in 1850 (crop of 1849). Virginia, still easily the leader in the old tobacco area, reported 123,968,312 pounds in 1860, the figures for 1850 having been considerably less than half, or 56,803,227. This was surely no mean record for a state that had such a long history as a tobacco producer. The South was truly a dynamic section in the 1850's, a region of great opportunities and of intense activity in a number of lines. The North was developing industrially as the South was not; the population of the North was increasing much more rapidly; northern bankers were financing the planters of the South to a great extent (not without ample compensation); and northern capitalists were, along with foreign capitalists, handling the exports and imports of the South. Nevertheless, the southern situation and prospect were far from being dark or discouraging. Economic conditions did not call very loudly for war in 1861.⁹

Slavery had really expanded to its natural limits by the 1850's, though the agitators of both sections failed to recognize this fundamental fact. If those elements, North and South, who should have understood the actual situation had been able to add two and two and get four as a result of the operation, they could have enlightened enough of the American people to have prevented most of the sectional strife of the 1850's and the war that followed. When the writers of the "Appeal of the Independent Democrats" spread the idea that the Kansas-Nebraska bill, if passed by Congress, would convert the western area involved into "a dreary region of despotism inhabited by masters and slaves,"

⁹ The meaning is that the economic situation of the South was comparatively good in 1861. Only when taking a view of a long period can one discover economic forces working in favor of secession (and war if necessary) in 1861. The revolution which led to the formation of the Confederate States of America was certainly not produced by economic distress in the short view. The fundamental influence seems to have been the demonstrated fact that the new Republican party was strong enough to elect the President and a majority of the national House of Representatives without the slightest aid from any slaveholding state. It is true that the South was in no immediate danger from the Republicans, but clearly the time to strike for independence was at hand if the South was ever to make the trial. The truth is that a better hour had come and gone a decade earlier, but it had been permitted to pass without action because no situation arose that was striking enough to unite the South.

they were peddling arrant nonsense. Likewise, when, after 1854, southern leaders demanded that Congress should enact legislation protecting slavery in the existing Federal territories, they were making a fight for laws that could not possibly bring any tangible results should they be passed. The opportunity was present for both southern and northern "fire-eaters" to get hold of a sane diagnosis of the situation. When Webster declared on the seventh of March, 1850, that he was not in favor of re-enacting the will of God or reaffirming an ordinance of nature, he stood on solid ground. The Douglas doctrine of nonintervention by Congress either to prohibit or establish slavery in a Federal territory was in the 1850's a statesmanlike offering to his countrymen. On January 30, 1854, Douglas said on the floor of the Senate in regard to the future of slavery in the country covered by the pending Nebraska bill: "But when settlers rush in—when labor becomes plenty, and therefore cheap, in that climate, with its productions, it is worse than folly to think of it being a slave-holding country. . . . I have no idea that it could." These were sensible statements and their author continued to stand up against those who would not "stop, look, and listen." Nevertheless, in spite of his large following, the Republican party, after a period of wavering, held out for the application of the Wilmot Proviso to all territories; Lincoln was elected president in 1860; and his election was made the occasion for a trial of secession.¹⁰

The move for southern independence, which began in 1861, was a constitutional revolution if there ever was one. The men who engi-

¹⁰ In so far as the South pressed for the extension of slavery into new western areas after the close of the Mexican War, it was contending against deeper and more powerful forces than the antislavery movement of the North. There were geographic conditions in the areas of the United States that remained to be colonized, and the fact was that the North had reached a point where its ability to colonize new territories was greater than that of the South. The struggle to establish slavery in Kansas Territory was foredoomed to failure because of these two factors, and there was no remaining unsettled region in the United States where the conditions were not less favorable to slavery than in Kansas. See the author's studies: "Population Movements in Relation to the Struggle for Kansas," in *Studies in American History, Inscribed to James Albert Woodburn* (Bloomington, 1926), 383-404; and "Popular Sovereignty and the Colonization of Kansas from 1854 to 1860," in Mississippi Valley Historical Association, *Proceedings* (Cedar Rapids, 1909-1918), IX (1915-1918), 392. See also, the valuable study by Charles W. Ramsdell, "The Natural Limits of Slavery Expansion," in *Mississippi Valley Historical Review* (Cedar Rapids, 1915-), XVI (1930), 151-71.

neered the revolution were not radicals though the term has often been applied to them. They were, it is true, in many respects extreme conservatives, but a conservative who is willing to resort to extreme measures does not become a radical. The Confederate Constitution was not framed by men who hated the Federal Constitution. Confederate officials and military leaders did not free slaves nor arm them in order to win the war, though a moment's reflection will convince anyone that there existed a real possibility. Indeed, southern leaders were handicapped by their anxiety to live up to their theories of the Constitution and by their general conservatism. Since the South wanted to become an independent nation, it would have been far better to have issued a declaration of independence when forming a confederation. Then, the armies could have fought a war to sustain a revolutionary movement pure and simple.¹¹

Any nation with a written constitution will have natural struggles over the interpretation of its provisions, and such contests should be healthful and valuable. When powerful interests in any country with a written constitution make a fetish of the instrument and use it as a basis for preventing any and every development which they do not like, they destroy the fundamental value of the document. The South has had too many logicians who have worked overtime exercising their ingenuity on the Constitution both before and since the conflict of the 1860's. During the last generation, however, they have been overshadowed by a class of northern leaders who love the Constitution because they can

¹¹ To assert that the South would have performed more sanely had it thrown constitutionalism to the winds and proceeded as did the leaders of 1776 by issuing a declaration of independence means, of course, to make a statement that cannot be proved. The well-established habit of southern leaders of trying to obtain what they wanted and stave off what they did not want by appealing to the Constitution, or to an interpretation of it which suited their purposes, stood as a powerful barrier to direct revolutionary action in 1860-1861. The contention that secession was constitutional was challenged even by James Buchanan, and, though eleven states went through the process of secession, there had to be a war for independence. The constitutional theories that southern leaders carried into and through the war years crippled the South in its military efforts. The powerful current that carried the South along through four years of conflict was not a determination to sustain the constitutional right of secession at any sacrifice nor to sustain slavery no matter what the cost, but to establish the Confederacy as an independent nation. To most of the men who served in the Confederate armies and to most of the families from which they came, the Civil War was a war for independence.

use it so often and so readily to prevent changes opposed by the great business interests of the country. Calhoun said a good thing when he declared in his early period as a national leader that the Constitution "was not intended as a thesis for the logician to exercise his ingenuity on." It may well be added today that it was likewise not designed as an instrument which agents of powerful interests, in the guise of public servants, might use to block legislation necessary to protect the rights and promote the general welfare of the American people.

Having survived the effects of the war and the blunders of political reconstruction, the South slowly recovered. It is today a section with several unsolved problems, it is true, but yet a section with great possibilities. Not the least of the encouraging signs is the thorough reconciliation that has come about between the South and the North. One can search the pages of history and find nothing like it. A native of the North can travel extensively in the South or live in any southern state and find it impossible to sense as a reality that four long years of war ended only seventy-seven years ago. It has become to the people of the two sections largely a matter of mere historical knowledge. There is a serious danger, indeed, that life in the two parts of the country will become too nearly uniform. Reading the same literature, fed on the same propaganda, listening to the same radio programs, looking at the same films, consuming the same soft drinks, driving the same kinds of cars over the same kinds of roads, wearing the same brands of clothing, staging intersectional football contests, producing Rotarians and Kiwanians of identical types, boasting Chambers of Commerce equally reactionary—how can it be expected that the South and the North will remain different? There is strength in unity; and co-operation in great undertakings is inspiring and promotes success. On the other hand, is it not true, that, to have the future to which it is entitled, the South should maintain a culture of its own?

Is it not possible for the industrialists of the South to discard many of the objectives and methods that have characterized the North and evolve and carry through far-reaching plans of their own? Is it not possible for the agricultural problems of the South to be solved by

southern people in co-operation with the Federal government? They cannot be solved by individuals, each following his own bent, and neither will the plans adapted to northern agriculture work out in the South, the conditions and the products being different. To succeed, plans must be evolved that will serve the interests of all concerned. A planned agriculture seems the only solution, no matter how great the effort or how long the time required.

If industrialism could be checked and eventually eradicated from the South, and the people return to a dependence on agriculture and its handmaiden, commerce, an ideal situation might prevail. How such a regime could be maintained if established without an almost absolute control of the size of families it is difficult to understand. An agricultural society cannot continue to maintain a high standard of living unless the demand for products constantly expands, or the area involved can be extended, or population become stationary. The last two seem out of the question for the South, and the prospect of the first does not seem promising and would be subject to very great variation at best. Undoubtedly, industry is destined to become more and more extensive in the South, and this development is sure to be accompanied by other changes of great importance. There will be plenty of new problems, the solution of which will cause many outworn and treasured traditions to vanish from the earth.

The race question was not solved by emancipation. Numerous problems that abolitionists ascribed to slavery were merely those sure to be present when two essentially different races live together. The solution of these problems is very difficult. The proper social, economic, and political relations between two such races are not easily worked out but they cannot be left for chance and circumstances to determine. The South has gone a long way towards the creation of a satisfactory and just regime. There is, however, a long road ahead to be followed before a permanent adjustment can be made. Perhaps no such adjustment can ever be fully effected. Nearly all outsiders are willing to leave this race question to the southern people, which seems the very best thing to do,

but the meaning of this is that the South can never ignore or neglect it, even for the briefest season.

One can predict nothing less than a great future for the South. It has had unique and stirring history. The record has not been a long one, while centuries lie ahead. As they pass, this great region should play a leading and worthy role. The present generation of Southerners, including its historical students and writers, can do no better than to lay the soundest foundations possible as a basis for coming achievements.

The Virginia-Chickasaw Treaty of 1783

BY ROBERT S. COTTERILL

The Virginia-Chickasaw Treaty of 1783 deserves to rank as one of the major curiosities of American history. It was made in North Carolina by the Governor of Virginia with a tribe of Indians living in the present state of Mississippi; it brought to an official close a war that no longer existed and initiated a peace that was already two years old; made after fifteen months of arduous effort, the record of the proceedings was promptly lost and historians have been able to divine its contents only by the application of pure reason, that is, by speculation. The treaty is of no great importance in itself, but it is of considerable interest because the negotiations cut across practically every issue of southern frontier history from 1778 to 1784. Involved in it are such diverse factors as the conquest of the Northwest by Virginia, Indian invasion of Kentucky from Canada, land speculation in North Carolina, western land claims by Georgia, conflict of British and Spanish in the Southwest, and constitutional interpretation of the Articles of Confederation.

The war which the treaty officially closed was caused by the erection of Fort Jefferson by Virginia on Chickasaw territory near the junction of the Ohio and Mississippi rivers.¹ This fort was projected in 1778 as an accessory of George Rogers Clark's Illinois campaign and was then

¹ So the Chickasaw steadily maintained. George Rogers Clark, however, claimed that the Chickasaw and other southern Indians began to attack the Mississippi traffic in 1778. Clark to ?, June 26, 1783, in William P. Palmer, Sherwin McRae, *et al.* (eds.), *Calendar of Virginia State Papers . . .*, [1652-1869], 11 vols. (Richmond, 1875-1893), III, 501.

designed to protect Virginia's tenuous supply line down the Mississippi to New Orleans.² But when it was finally built, in April, 1780, its primary purpose was to serve as a concentration point for garrisons to be withdrawn from their exposed position in the Illinois country.³ Governor Thomas Jefferson intended the erection of the fort to be preceded by a land purchase, but he made the mistake—a very curious one—of thinking the land was owned by the Cherokee and so attempted a purchase from that tribe.⁴ Upon learning that it was not Cherokee but Chickasaw land, he justified the building of the fort without prior land purchase by the allegation that the Chickasaw had already begun hostilities against Virginia.⁵ Whether they had or not, they certainly showed hostility after this. They swarmed around the fort, cut off its supplies, killed and captured stragglers from the garrison, and at one time subjected the fort to such a close and protracted siege that only the timely arrival of reinforcements saved it from destruction. Virginia abandoned the fort in June, 1781.⁶ After this the Chickasaw seem to have made no further efforts against Kentucky and the neglected war dwindled away to an undeclared peace.

In the spring of 1782 the Chickasaw, after abstaining from war for a year, began to make overtures for peace. In April of that year a Cherokee delegation visiting Colonel Evan Shelby on Beaver Creek delivered to him a peace "talk" which a Chickasaw messenger had brought to the Cherokee towns but had been afraid to carry on to Joseph Martin

² Patrick Henry to Governor of Illinois, January 14, 1778, in Henry R. McIlwaine (ed.), *Official Letters of the Governors of the State of Virginia*, 3 vols. (Richmond, 1926-1929), I, 227-29. Cited hereinafter as *Official Letters*.

³ Thomas Jefferson to Speaker of the House, June 14, 1780, in George Rogers Clark Papers, in R. C. Ballard-Thruston Collection, Photocopy Print, B2, No. 443. This invaluable collection of photostats is in the Filson Club, Louisville, Kentucky. It will be referred to hereinafter as Clark Photostats.

⁴ *Id.* to Joseph Martin, January 24, 1780, in *Official Letters*, II, 87. Martin was the Virginia Agent for the Cherokee. His home was at Long Island in the Holston, actually on North Carolina territory.

⁵ *Id.* to the Speaker of the House, June 14, 1780, in Clark Photostats, B2, No. 443. Jefferson's belief in Chickasaw depredations was apparently based on information he had just received from John Todd, the lieutenant of Illinois County. *Ibid.*, No. 395.

⁶ Clark Photostats, C4, No. 815. The fort was abandoned apparently as a result of recommendations by Colonel John Montgomery. *Ibid.*, B2, Nos. 995, 996, 997.

at Long Island as he had been instructed.⁷ Receiving no answer to this message to Martin, the Chickasaw held a council on July 9 following and decided to appeal to Clark. In a written message they declared that they desired to make peace with the Americans without abandoning the English who had always supported them against their French, Spanish, and Indian enemies; they had gone to war only because of Fort Jefferson and had not harmed any Americans except those at the fort. They requested an answer by the bearer.⁸

The desire of the Chickasaw to obtain a peace which they already had is open to a number of explanations. They told Clark that they were asking for peace because the Illinois Indians were urging them to do so. Undoubtedly the Illinois Indians were urging them, but one may well be skeptical as to the weight of their solicitations. Clark thought the Chickasaw wanted peace because they expected an invasion from Kentucky.⁹ If they had any such expectation, it indicates that their intelligence service was in a very bad way. In all probability the Chickasaw move was due to Spanish pressure. Governor Bernardo Galvez by his conquest of West Florida had driven a wedge between the British and their Chickasaw allies, cutting the latter off from British supplies and assistance. Now the Spanish were offering trade and supplies to the Chickasaw and urging them to make peace with the Americans. The Chickasaw message to Martin in April had told him that the tribe had received three stores of goods from Mobile and was feeling friendly to Spaniards, French, and Americans. In effect, the astute pilots of the Chickasaw were tacking to the new winds that were blowing.

Bearing a written message entitled "A talk to be delivered by Mr. Simon Burney to the commanders of every station between this nation

⁷ Evan Shelby to Arthur Campbell, May 20, 1782, in *Calendar of Virginia State Papers*, III, 170-73. The Chickasaw messenger had traveled through the Creek country and had attended a council there held by an agent of the Spanish Governor of West Florida. The Spanish encouraged the messenger in his mission.

⁸ *Calendar of Virginia State Papers*, III, 277-79. This talk was signed by Poyman Tauhaw, Mingo Homan (The Red King), Turkaw Potapo, and Poymingo (The Mountain Leader). It was probably written by one of the Colberts or by Simon Burney.

⁹ Clark to Benjamin Harrison, October 18, 1782, in James A. James (ed.), *George Rogers Clark Papers, 1781-1784*, in Theodore C. Pease (ed.), *Collections of the Illinois State Historical Library* (Springfield, 1903-), *Virginia Series*, IV (1926), 136.

and the falls of the Ohio River," Burney and two Chickasaw warriors set out from the Chickasaw towns.¹⁰ They were bound to Louisville to see Clark and the letter they bore was in the nature of a passport to be viséd at every American post they passed. They stopped first at French Lick (Nashville), showed their credentials, and went on to Kentucky.¹¹ They arrived in Lincoln County, Kentucky—presumably at St. Asaphs—August 20, and delivered their letter to Colonel Benjamin Logan, the county lieutenant. Colonel John Donelson and Colonel John Bowman, also, were apprised of the Chickasaw mission; probably they were called into consultation by Logan. The result of their cogitations was that each of the three, separately but in evident collaboration, sent a letter to Governor Benjamin Harrison communicating the news. Logan took from Burney the original of the peace "talk" and inclosed it in his letter. They all urged that the Chickasaw overtures be accepted and that a conference be held. Bowman and Donelson advised that the conference be held at French Lick; Bowman and Logan both recommended Donelson as a proper person for holding it.¹²

This virulent outbreak of *cacoëthes scribendi* among the Kentucky colonels is to be understood only by reference to Kentucky conditions and Kentucky politics. Two days before the Chickasaw mission arrived at St. Asaphs, Kentucky had experienced the disaster at Lower Blue Licks where seventy-five men had been killed by the invading Canadians and Indians. The news of this defeat must have reached Logan about the same time the Chickasaw arrived and he was already raising the Lincoln militia to march to the battlefield. The colonels fully expected another invasion from the north and so wanted to be sure that the southern Indians would remain quiet while they were meeting it. They

¹⁰ For Burney, see Harry Warren, "Some Chickasaw Chiefs and Prominent Men," in *Publications of the Mississippi Historical Society* (Oxford and University, 1898-1904; Centenary Series, Jackson, 1916-1925), VIII (1904), 569.

¹¹ Campbell to William Davies, October 3, 1782, in James (ed.), *George Rogers Clark Papers, 1781-1784*, p. 123.

¹² John Bowman to Harrison, August 30, 1782, *ibid.*, 99-101; Benjamin Logan to *id.*, August 31, 1782, in *Calendar of Virginia State Papers*, III, 280-83; John Donelson to *id.*, September 1, 1782, *ibid.*, 284. These same letters bore the news of the defeat at Lower Blue Licks. The Chickasaw talk had not proposed a conference but Burney was probably authorized to do so. It was Burney who gave the colonels the impression that the Creeks also wanted peace.

did not trust Clark, believing that he had neglected the defense of Kentucky while he concentrated his attention on Fort Jefferson and Fort Nelson (Louisville). They doubtless foresaw that Clark would use the Chickasaw desire for peace as a means of obtaining the restoration of Fort Jefferson which they had always opposed. This they hoped to forestall by throwing the negotiations into the hands of Harrison.

Their hopes were not realized because when Burney finally arrived at Louisville with the peace "talks," Clark at once took the matter in his own hands ignoring the act of the colonels in referring it to Harrison. He promptly sent the Chickasaw delegation home and he sent with it two agents of his own, Captain Robert George and John Donne, carrying two peace "talks" in answer to that he had received. In one of these Clark gave the assurances the Chickasaw desired, although he insisted that Fort Jefferson was not the cause, but the consequence, of the war, and advised the Chickasaw to sell George all their Kentucky land from the Ohio to a line twenty-two miles below the old fort; on this land Virginia wanted to build a great town which would be an entrepôt for Chickasaw trade.¹³ Having thus done his utmost to checkmate the colonels, Clark wrote to Harrison relating what he had done and asking approval.¹⁴

But even before Clark wrote, Governor Harrison had received the letters from the colonels and had acted on their suggestions. In the middle of October he named Martin and Donelson as commissioners to confer with the Chickasaw and directed them to arrange the time and place of the meeting. It was Harrison's idea that Donelson, since he was in Kentucky and therefore nearer the Chickasaw, should handle

¹³ *Calendar of Virginia State Papers*, III, 297-300. The two peace talks are dated September 10, 1782, and one of them was written from Fort Nelson. They are without signatures but internal evidence shows that they were written by Clark. They are addressed "To the Chicasaw Chiefs" and "To the Great Chiefs and Warriors of the Chicasaw Nation," and name specifically the four chiefs who had sent the peace talk to Clark.

¹⁴ Clark to Harrison, October 18, 1782, in James (ed.), *George Rogers Clark Papers, 1781-1784*, p. 136. It will be noted that Clark did not write to Harrison until five weeks after he had dispatched Robert George and John Donne. Captain George had been in command at Fort Jefferson, but he seems to have been held in high esteem by the Chickasaw. Clark wrote to Harrison that Burney had given a hint that the Chickasaw were willing to make a sale, and that he had sent George to them merely to lend dignity to the negotiations.

the preliminary arrangements, and he told Martin to write Donelson to that effect. A week later he wrote to Governor Alexander Martin of North Carolina telling him of the proposed conference and inviting him to name a commissioner to represent North Carolina.¹⁵ In none of these letters did Governor Harrison make mention of a land purchase; his aim was limited to offsetting the expected invasion from the north. But in December, Clark's letter arrived and Harrison added a land purchase to his peace program. He wrote Clark, after consulting the council, approving his action but warning him against recognizing Indian land titles lest such a recognition be used against Virginia by those claiming land by Indian purchase in the Northwest.¹⁶

When Harrison wrote to Clark, he was expecting the treaty to be made in the spring of 1783 but a little later he received a letter from Joseph Martin from which he learned that Martin had not notified Donelson to make the preliminary arrangement. Harrison added Isaac Shelby to the commission, and sent Martin definite instructions for the three with peremptory orders to communicate with Donelson at once.¹⁷ Meanwhile Donelson had been waiting in Lincoln County until he had finally lost all patience and had set out for Long Island to see Joseph Martin. When he arrived there January 2, 1783, he found that Martin

¹⁵ Harrison to Joseph Martin, October 15, 1782, in *Official Letters*, III, 344; *id.* to Governor Alexander Martin, October 22, 1782, in Walter Clark (ed.), *The State Records of North Carolina*, 16 vols., XI-XXVI (Raleigh, 1895-1906), XVI, 441-42. In his letter to Governor Martin, Harrison expressed a wish that the southern states hold a general conference to plan the regulation of Indian affairs in the South. Apparently he had no thought that such a course (or his own treaty-making) conflicted with the provision of the Articles of Confederation giving Congress the power of "regulating the trade and managing all affairs with the Indians, not members of any of the states, provided that the legislative right of any state within its own limits be not infringed or violated." The meaning of the provision hinges on the word "members." There were no Indians in the United States not *inhabitants* of any state. At any rate, Virginia, North Carolina, and Georgia all maintained Indian agents and all made Indian treaties in the Confederation period.

¹⁶ Harrison to Clark, December 19, 1782, in *Official Letters*, III, 406. Harrison warned Clark not to buy any land in North Carolina, and reminded him that Dr. Thomas Walker had ascertained the boundary between the two states. Harrison suggested that the land purchase might be completed when the Virginia commissioners met the Chickasaw at French Lick, and he expressed a hope that Clark could attend the conference. He inclosed in his letter a talk for the Chickasaw, principally concerned with the land purchase. There is no reason to believe that the Chickasaw ever received it.

¹⁷ Harrison to Joseph Martin, January 6, 1783, in *Official Letters*, III, 422; *id.* to *id.*,

was absent in the Cherokee country. Martin did not return until February 1; he brought back with him Major John Reid whom he had employed to carry his dispatches to Harrison. As Martin had not yet heard from Harrison (due to the failure of Harrison's messenger), he and Donelson hurried Reid off to Richmond to bring back their instructions, intending to send him on to the Chickasaw when he returned.¹⁸ Reid evidently made what haste he could on his journey, but bad roads and swollen rivers delayed him so that he did not reach Richmond until March 6. After a week's detention he set out on his return trip to Long Island with the long-awaited instructions. The three commissioners were instructed to secure a release of prisoners, to secure the banishment of the Natchez men who had been harassing the Mississippi trade, and to assist Captain George in his land purchase if it were not already completed.¹⁹

There was a further delay at Long Island and it was April 14 when Reid set out from that place for the Chickasaw nation. Instead of taking the comparatively easy route down the Holston and Tennessee he went through Kentucky in order to visit Shelby who was to make the final decision on the time and place of the treaty.²⁰ On his way through Kentucky Reid met Clark, who was going to Richmond, and probably learned from him of the failure of George's mission. George, on reaching the Chickasaw in October, 1782, had found the chiefs so implacably opposed to a land cession that when he met the council he did not even

Donelson, and Shelby, January 11, 1783, *ibid.* Martin was to instruct Donelson to find out from Clark whether or not George had been successful. If he had been, Harrison intimated the French Lick conference would be dropped. The commissioners were authorized to pay £700 for the land, and were warned not to buy territory in the limits of North Carolina.

¹⁸ Donelson to Harrison, February 2, 1783, in *Calendar of Virginia State Papers*, III, 427; Martin to *id.*, February 2, 1783, in James (ed.), *George Rogers Clark Papers, 1781-1784*, p. 189.

¹⁹ John Reid to *id.*, February 24, 1784, in *Calendar of Virginia State Papers*, 562-64. This long letter gives full details of Reid's itinerary from Long Island to Richmond, back to Long Island, and thence to the Chickasaw country. All statements relating to Reid in this paper are based on this letter unless otherwise indicated.

²⁰ The delay was caused partly by the fact that Donelson had left Long Island in Reid's absence, and partly because Martin was trying to secure a guard for Reid on his journey. A guard was not available and Reid finally set out accompanied only by his servant and a party of men bound for Kentucky.

mention the subject. He merely expressed the pleasure of Virginia at having peace restored, gave an explanation of the Revolution, and promised trade and supplies. The chiefs in reply reiterated their own desire for peace, blamed the English for the Chickasaw-American war, and promised to send delegates to Clark the next spring to speak of "other business."²¹

At this meeting Clark advised Reid to go to the Chickasaw by way of Louisville and down the Ohio and Mississippi; he also advised him to hold the treaty at Louisville instead of at French Lick, since provisions were very scanty at the latter place.²² It is possible to believe that this advice was not wholly disinterested. Reid, however, went on to Shelby's, arriving April 23. Shelby was not at home but when he returned he advised Reid to arrange for the treaty at French Lick at the full moon in October. The late date was deemed desirable because provisions were scarce at French Lick and because the Chickasaw would need time to persuade the Creeks to attend.²³ Armed with this advice Reid set out and after traveling fifteen days arrived at French Lick on May 17. There it seemed for a time his mission would end, because James Robertson and the other members of the Governing Committee of the Cumberland Association viewed without enthusiasm their prospective role of host to a body of hungry and inconstant Indians. But after an appeal by Reid they decided on a plebiscite and this resulted in favor of the treaty.²⁴ Reid was now free to continue his journey, but he

²¹ *Calendar of Virginia State Papers*, III, 356-58. The Chickasaw council was held October 24, 1782. "Other business" probably referred to the land purchase negotiations.

²² Clark to Harrison, April 30, 1783, in James (ed.), *George Rogers Clark Papers, 1781-1783*, pp. 229-30.

²³ Shelby to *id.*, December 1, 1783, in *Calendar of Virginia State Papers*, III, 544-45. Shelby knew conditions at French Lick because he had just returned from that place to Kentucky in March. He had received his appointment as commissioner before Reid arrived, but apparently he never received his instructions.

²⁴ "Records of the Cumberland Association," in *American Historical Magazine and Tennessee Historical Society Quarterly* (Nashville, 1896-1904), VII, (1902), 132. Of the five stations around the Lick, three took part in the plebiscite with the following results: Freeland's, 32 against the treaty, none for; Heatonburg, 1 against, 54 for; Nashboro, 26 against, 30 for. Reid had brought a letter from Donelson to James Robertson asking him to furnish Reid with guides for the remainder of his journey. *Calendar of Virginia State Papers*, III, 459.

appeared in no haste to do so, lingering at the Lick for nearly six weeks before setting out, July 14, on the last lap of his trip.

Meanwhile, since Reid apparently had written to no one of his problems and progress, various interested persons began to display symptoms of impatience and even exasperation. Among these were Joseph Martin and Donelson. Martin had taken occasion, while waiting for Reid's return, to visit North Carolina on Cherokee business; while there, he was appointed Indian Agent for that state to the Cherokee and Chickamauga and was engaged by the Blount group of speculators to buy land at Muscle Shoals for them in the treaty which he was then arranging for Virginia with the Chickamauga; Donelson, probably at Martin's suggestion, was also engaged for the same task.²⁵ Martin expected to go on with the Chickasaw treaty as soon as he returned from North Carolina, but when he reached Long Island, May 17, 1783, he found that Reid had neither returned nor written. Martin heard indirectly that Reid had reached French Lick and was "idling his time away" at that place. Martin and Donelson waited until June and then, thoroughly disgusted with their deliberate and incommunicative envoy, dispatched a second messenger, Samuel Evings, who was to go down the Holston and Tennessee to the Chickasaw country. While waiting for Evings to return, Martin and Donelson hurried on their negotiations with the Chickamauga and held a treaty with them at Long Island on July 9; it was at the close of this treaty that they made the purchase of land in the "Bent" of the Tennessee for the notorious "Muscle Shoals Land Speculation."²⁶

The last of July, still having no word from Reid, and Evings not having returned, Donelson started to Kentucky as a commissioner charged with the duty of making a treaty with the Shawnee at the falls. While in Kentucky he learned that an expedition was being prepared against the Chickamauga—with whom Virginia had so recently made a treaty of peace. Against this astonishing supplement to the Virginia

²⁵ Joseph Martin to Harrison, April 14, 1783, in *Calendar of Virginia State Papers*, III, 468-69; Thomas P. Abernethy, *Western Lands and the American Revolution* (New York, 1937), 261.

²⁶ Joseph Martin to Harrison, July 20, 1783, in *Calendar of Virginia State Papers*, III, 511-12; *id.* to *id.*, February 16, 1784, *ibid.*, 560-61.

peace policy Donelson protested so vigorously that the expedition was abandoned, but he was henceforth decidedly in the bad graces of the Kentucky colonels who had sponsored the idea.²⁷ While Donelson was in Kentucky, Evings returned: he had not reached the Chickasaw towns but had fallen in with some Chickasaw chiefs on the Tennessee who told him that the treaty would have to be deferred because the Chickasaw were starving. They added, apparently by way of a clincher, that smallpox was raging in the land.²⁸ To Martin and Donelson this seemed to put an end to the treaty-making; Martin busied himself with the duties of his double agency and Donelson, when he returned from Kentucky, seems to have gone to the Muscle Shoals region with his colleagues in speculation.

The Chickasaw chiefs, whom Evings met, had protested too much; their reasons were too numerous to be anything but excuses. The truth was that the Chickasaw were divided into an American faction and a Spanish faction, and Evings had encountered chiefs of the Spanish faction. The American faction was eager to ally the nation with the Americans but was bewildered by the apparent lack of response to the overtures of the previous year. On July 25, 1783, having no knowledge either of the past visit of Evings or the approaching one of Reid, General James Colbert wrote from the Chickasaw nation to the Governor of Virginia depicting conditions in his tribe. He said that Spain had always been their greatest aversion, but the Chickasaw, now abandoned by the English, needed trade and the Spanish were offering it. The young men of the tribe were pro-Spanish but the English were advising friendship with the Americans: the chiefs wanted to follow this advice but did not know where to apply. He pointed out that the Chickasaw could be useful to the Americans both on the Mississippi and against

²⁷ Donelson to *id.*, March 3, 1784, *ibid.*, 567.

²⁸ Joseph Martin to *id.*, August 11, 1783, in Clark Photostats, F4, No. 825. Samuel Evings arrived at Long Island on August 8, after a fifty-five-day trip. He had gone down the Tennessee to Chickasaw Landing where he met a party of French and Spanish traders from Illinois with goods for the Chickasaw. From the Landing, Evings set out on a two-day walk to the Chickasaw towns in northern Mississippi, but he met some chiefs on the way and got from them the information he took back to Joseph Martin. Evings did not visit the Chickasaw towns. Clark Photostats, F4, No. 485, contains a warrant to the Virginia auditor by Harrison for £30, apparently in payment for this journey.

the Spanish Indians. Three days after this letter was written a Chickasaw council at Chuckulissah adopted a "talk" to be sent to "His Excellency the President of the Honorable Congress of the United States." This "talk" also alluded to the difficulty the tribe was having in making peace with the Americans. It said that Spain and Georgia were demanding trade, the Illinois Indians threatening war, Virginia asking for land, and the Cumberland people already sending their surveyors into Chickasaw territory. They asked who was in authority in the United States—a question in constitutional law that was of interest to a great many people in 1783.²⁹

Still another expression of impatience with the delay in the treaty-making was voiced by Colonel Benjamin Logan. In apparently great bitterness of spirit he wrote to Governor Harrison in August complaining that the Indians were ravaging Kentucky while the treaty waited. He charged that the delay was due to neglect of duty by Donelson who was giving his attention to land speculation and was using his official position to further his private interests.³⁰ It was Logan who a year before had recommended Donelson as commissioner; there can be little doubt that his retarded insight into Donelson's character was occasioned by Donelson's opposition to the Chickamauga campaign on which the Kentucky colonels had set their hearts.

Meanwhile, apparently quite oblivious to the host of suspicions, exasperations, and complaints his conduct was engendering, Reid made his way from French Lick to the Chickasaw towns, arriving July 28. On August 1 a tribal council was held and the Chickasaw agreed to a treaty at French Lick at the full moon of October as Shelby had advised. Reid invited the band of Delawares living on the Tennessee to accompany the Chickasaw and sent an invitation to some of the Choctaw chiefs;

²⁹ *Calendar of Virginia State Papers*, III, 513-14, 515-17. The "talk" and letter were carried out of the nation by John Donne, who had accompanied George to the Chickasaw country and had remained with them when George returned. Donne arrived in Louisville by October 1 and, being unable to proceed because of losing his horse, turned over the letter and "talk" to Major George Walls, the commanding officer at Fort Nelson. Clark Photostats, F4, No. 851. They fell into the hands of James Wilkinson, who wrote to the President of Congress suggesting that the United States commission Donne to make a treaty with the Chickasaw. Abernethy, *Western Lands*, 300.

³⁰ Benjamin Logan to Harrison, August 11, 1783, in Clark Photostats, F4, No. 797.

the Creeks were asked to come November 1. Having done these things, Reid wrote to Shelby and Shelby sent the letter on to Martin with one of his own explaining that because of the recent death of his brother he, Shelby, would be unable to attend the treaty.³¹ Martin was surprised by the news that the treaty-making, which he had given up for lost on the strength of Eving's report, was still in prospect, and completely overwhelmed by the fact that Reid had apparently invited the entire Indian population of the South to be present. He wrote in great distress to Harrison that he would not have supplies for one fourth of them, that Shelby had declined the mission, and that Donelson had business in court which would keep him away.³²

The treaty was held, however, and it was held at French Lick with both Martin and Donelson present, although they were ten days late in arriving.³³ The Chickasaw came on time but no Delaware, Choctaw, or Creeks appeared. The treaty began November 5 and lasted two days. Martin and Donelson, speaking for Virginia, demanded a return of prisoners and expulsion of hostile whites from the Chickasaw country, and they added a demand for the expulsion of the Delaware. The Red King and Piomingo, answering for the Chickasaw, readily agreed to the first two demands but the Red King refused to commit himself about the Delaware until he could consult his council. Both Chickasaw chiefs demanded that the passage of whites through their land be

³¹ Reid to Shelby, August 2, 1783, in *Calendar of Virginia State Papers*, III, 519-20. Reid had been accompanied to the Chickasaw country by a Mr. Turnbull of French Lick and by two guides—Mallikiah Fry and George Flynn. *Ibid.*, 536, 539. His interpreter at the Chickasaw council was a British officer. Shelby in his reply roundly berated Reid for his slowness and expressed a hope that he (Reid) might be called to account. He intimated that Reid had been neglecting the treaty for his private interests. Shelby to Reid, September 28, 1783, *ibid.*, 533. The letter is inexplicable because Shelby himself had suggested the delay. Furthermore, he later wrote Harrison exonerating Reid and assuming the responsibility himself. *Id.* to Harrison, December 1, 1783, *ibid.*, 544-45.

³² Martin to *id.*, September 27, 1783, in Clark Photostats, F4, No. 850.

³³ The tardiness of the two commissioners was probably due to the distance they had to travel and to the difficulty of transporting supplies and presents. Reid furnished supplies for the Indians while they were waiting; it was his intention to take the Indian delegation on to Long Island in case the commissioners, as Shelby had predicted, did not arrive. Apparently the Chickasaw delegation was a very small one. The conferences were held at a large sulphur spring where Robertson later lived. The interpreter was Malcolm McGee, whom Reid had selected in the Chickasaw country. Reid had come back to French Lick October 14.

stopped and that intruders on their land be removed. In identical terms the two chiefs named the boundary of their lands: a line running along the Cumberland-Tennessee divide from the Ohio to Duck Creek and thence up Duck Creek to its source. Martin and Donelson agreed to all the Chickasaw demands, accepted the boundaries they named (so far as they were in Virginia), and, with a mutual interchange of compliments, the treaty ended.³⁴

The most significant thing about the treaty is its omissions: *there was no land cession and no mention of a land cession*. The desire for a cession of land was the only motive Virginia had for holding the treaty inasmuch as by November, 1783, the fear of an Indian invasion of Kentucky from the north (the original motive) had quite disappeared. But the Red King told Martin before the meeting began that the Chickasaw would not make a cession, and Martin did not mention the subject in the formal proceedings.³⁵

After the treaty Martin, Donelson, and Reid went home together arriving at Long Island December 12. They found awaiting them letters from Harrison blaming them for the delay in the treaty and censuring the commissioners for subordinating their public duties to private speculations. Reid replied with a detailed itinerary showing clearly that it was Shelby who was responsible for the late date; Donelson also

³⁴ The official record of the proceedings has apparently escaped the notice of historians. A copy is in the George Rogers Clark MSS. in the Virginia Archives, and I have consulted it in the Clark Photostats, F4, Nos. 913-20. Joseph Martin sent a copy to Colonel William Christian. Martin to Harrison, September 16, 1784, in *Calendar of Virginia State Papers*, III, 611. Presumably he sent one to Harrison, although his correspondence gives no indication of this. William Blount to Henry Knox, November 8, 1792, in *American State Papers*, 38 vols. (Washington, 1832-1861), *Indian Affairs*, I, 326; *id.* to *id.*, January 14, 1793, *ibid.*, 432.

³⁵ Joseph Martin to Harrison, May 3, 1784, in *Calendar of Virginia State Papers*, III, 581. The statement that the Chickasaw made a land cession at the French Lick conference has been repeatedly made by writers on the subject. Examples are James Moody, "Myths of the Cherokee," in *Nineteenth Annual Report of the Bureau of American Ethnology to the Secretary of the Smithsonian Institute, 1897-1898*, 2 pts. (Washington, 1900), Pt. I, 66; and Stephen B. Weeks, "General Joseph Martin and the War of the Revolution in the West," in American Historical Association, *Annual Report*, 1893 (Washington, 1894), 436. All such statements seem to rest on the letters of Blount to Knox referred to in n. 34, above, or to a misinterpretation of the record of the proceedings. It may be noted that Blount derived his information from an Indian trader, that he did not know the date of the treaty, and that he represented the cession as having been made to the United States.

threw the responsibility on Shelby. Both Martin and Donelson denied that they had neglected their public duties, pointing out that the Muscle Shoals purchase had been made long before the date set for the Chickasaw meeting; that the land bought did not belong to Virginia; and that they had bought it in their private capacities.³⁶ On this high Pooh-Bahian note the discussion ended and the treaty of 1783 passed into history, which promptly forgot it.

³⁶ These various letters are given in the *Calendar of Virginia State Papers*, III, 547-64. Harrison had also written on the subject to the Governor of Georgia, and this letter falling into Joseph Martin's hands drew from him a further protestation of innocence. Martin to Harrison, July 22, 1784, *ibid.*, 601-602.

The Grange and Farmer Education In Mississippi

BY JAMES S. FERGUSON

The twentieth-century South has shown itself to be intensely interested in education. Particularly has its interest been manifested in attempts to lift the educational level of the southern farmer and to induce him to use scientific methods of agriculture. Recent land conservation programs with government sponsorship have accelerated a movement that for years received its principal encouragement from agricultural colleges, Smith-Hughes high schools, and county farm demonstration agencies. One of the most concerted efforts toward improving the educational status of the farmer, however, came from an organization that had its southern origins in Reconstruction days and which in some places continued its activity into the period of the New South. It is with the work of this society in one southern state that this study will deal.

The Patrons of Husbandry, or the Grange, as it is commonly called, entered Mississippi in May, 1871.¹ Stressing education, but at the same time describing to farmers the advantages of consumers' co-operatives and class organization, this agricultural fraternity attracted many members to its ranks. In less than four years it had a membership exceeding 30,000. Chapters were to be found in every county of the state.² A veritable Grange vogue existed. In 1876, however, a decline set in that

¹ Oliver H. Kelley, *Origin and Progress of the Order of the Patrons of Husbandry* (Philadelphia, 1875), 318, 323, 327.

² Harry A. Caton, National Secretary of the Grange, to John D. Barnhart, January 10, 1940. This letter, based on charter applications on file in the national office, is in the possession of John D. Barnhart, Indiana University, Bloomington.

continued with slight interruptions to 1898, when the order became inactive in Mississippi.³ Various forces, such as the failure of co-operatives and disapproval of Grange political leanings, contributed to this decline. Nevertheless, in its twenty-eight years of existence, the Grange made many contributions to the progress of the state.

Early in its history the Grange began to emphasize education as its primary objective. The National Grange in 1874 announced that "The moral, social and intellectual features are the leading features of the order, and . . . all other features are subordinate to these and should be kept forever so by this order."⁴ Some Mississippi farmers indicated their approval of this emphasis and stated their expectations of receiving educational benefits from membership in the Grange. A banner at a Grange celebration in Columbus bore the words, "Brothers, Let Us Organize and Educate, for Knowledge is Power."⁵ One member wrote approvingly, "The Grange is a school at which every farmer in the land can acquire information, establish advantageous relationships and place himself in the current of human affairs."⁶ Similar comment was to be found in many editorials of the day.⁷

There was need in Mississippi for an organization that would stress education. Before the war an inefficient school system had given inadequate training to the masses of people. In 1870 there were over 23,000 illiterate white adults in the state, and many others had had only meager schooling.⁸ Leaders recognized the general ignorance of the farming class. One editor wrote, "The loose screw in farming machinery is ignorance."⁹ In another instance it was said that the monopoly to be

³ *Ibid.*; James M. White, "Professional, Literary, and Industrial Organizations," in *Publications of the Mississippi Historical Society* (Oxford and University, 1898-1914; Centenary Series, Jackson, 1917-1925), V (1902), 166.

⁴ Mississippi State Grange *Proceedings*, V (Jackson, 1875), 25-26. This pamphlet is in the Library of the Wisconsin Historical Society, Madison. A microfilmed copy was used.

⁵ Newton (Mississippi) *Weekly Ledger*, December 25, 1873.

⁶ Columbus (Mississippi) *Patron of Husbandry*, December 6, 1879.

⁷ Newton *Weekly Ledger*, July 3, September 25, 1873; Jackson (Mississippi) *Weekly Clarion*, May 29, July 3, 1873.

⁸ Stuart G. Noble, *Forty Years of the Public Schools in Mississippi* (New York, 1918), 3, 20-22.

⁹ Raymond (Mississippi) *Hinds County Gazette*, March 15, 1876.

feared most by farmers was the monopoly on brains held by other classes.¹⁰

Farmers were appallingly ignorant of scientific methods of agriculture. One man advised his colaborers to improve their land by planting ordinary Indian corn and plowing it under while green.¹¹ The methods of the average farmer can be shown by the attitudes of men questioned about the use of Paris green to kill the vexatious army worm. In thirty-one counties out of forty-two in which farmers were consulted, poison was not even used. One man reported that the use of poison "would prevent the keeping of calves in cotton-fields, and it is, besides, regarded as far too troublesome." Another said the poison killed both the worm and the plant. Yet, farmers who had investigated the proper use of the poison were prompt to say that as much as seven eighths of the crop was saved by its use.¹² Such great divergence of practice and opinion concerning proper methods signified to farm leaders a great need for exchange of information.

Still another faulty farming practice was the custom of planting cotton almost exclusively. According to Professor Eugene W. Hilgard of the University of Mississippi, the one-crop system was primarily responsible for sapping the fertility of the prairies of Northeast Mississippi.¹³ Furthermore, excessive attention to cotton precluded the raising of food supplies, which resulted in a higher cost of production. The editor of the *Raymond Hinds County Gazette* observed that it was common for farmers to buy vegetables from Illinois at high cost.¹⁴ In order to buy food, most farmers had to depend on credit from the merchant who demanded a high rate of interest.¹⁵ Since diversification of crops promised a solution of some of the farmer's greatest problems, the Grange adopted this principle as one of its fundamental tenets. Throughout the

¹⁰ *Ibid.*, February 21, 1877.

¹¹ *Ibid.*, June 19, 1872.

¹² *Tenth Census of the United States, 1880, Report on Cotton Production* (Washington, 1884), 355.

¹³ *Jackson Weekly Clarion*, January 2, 1873.

¹⁴ *Raymond Hinds County Gazette*, November 16, 23, 1870.

¹⁵ Robert Somers, *The Southern States Since the War, 1870-1* (London, 1871), 241-42; Vernon L. Wharton, "The Negro in Mississippi, 1865-1890" (Ph.D. dissertation, University of North Carolina, 1940), 123.

period of its existence, it emphasized to the farmer the wisdom of abandoning a one-crop economy.

Although the Grange was most active in promoting practical informal education, it recognized the importance of training coming generations in the schools of the state. Grange relations with the state school system in general led toward the achievement of three purposes: exercise of economy in the use of school funds, maintenance of a high standard of efficiency in the teaching corps, and modification of the curriculum in order to make school work more applicable to farm life.

Grangers voiced their demands for economy at a time when their school policy was colored with political prejudices. In 1870 Mississippi's first Republican government set up separate, free public schools for the children of both races. Members of the Grange, most of whom were Democratic in politics, disapproved of this action, partly because of their dislike for the "black Republicans." Their chief opposition, however, arose from their unwillingness to pay the added taxes that the new system would necessitate.¹⁶ The State Grange of 1874, in an economizing move, requested the Governor to abolish the office of county superintendent of education.¹⁷ Tippah County Grange suggested that dogs be taxed, for in this way, "*negroes would be compelled to educate their own children*" and thus decrease white tax burdens.¹⁸

Despite political prejudices, some Grangers supported the law of 1870 even while the hated Radicals were in power. At a county grange meeting it was stated that although taxes were high, education was of enough importance to justify the increased tax rate.¹⁹ "Plow Handles," a prolific Grange correspondent of the *Hinds County Gazette*, wrote

¹⁶ Noble, *Forty Years of Public Schools*, 38; Raymond *Hinds County Gazette*, September 30, 1874; January 6, 1875. Spirited complaints against the high cost of the public school system did not necessarily arise from Democratic desires to find pretexts for criticizing Republican administration measures. Encouraged by an ante-bellum prejudice against public schools, white property owners sincerely feared that construction of enough school buildings for both white and black children plus other expenditures would lead to confiscatory taxation. The fear was all the more present since whites were accustomed to a one-mill property tax. When the Democrats regained control of the state, they cut school expenditures drastically.

¹⁷ Mississippi State Grange *Proceedings*, V, 7.

¹⁸ *Ibid.*; Newton *Weekly Ledger*, April 15, 1875.

¹⁹ Jackson *Weekly Clarion*, November 12, 1874.

that the public school system, although inefficient, was necessary to the prosperity of the state.²⁰ Thus, it is apparent that Mississippi Grangers differed among themselves as to the form their educational policies should take. After 1876, however, most opposition to the public school system died out, partly because a new Democratic administration cut expenditures.²¹

In time Grangers became self-appointed guardians of the efficiency of the school system. Particularly did they exert influence toward the employing of competent teachers. To guard against the spread of northern propaganda, one grange passed a resolution asking native whites to take up teaching not only in white schools but in those for Negroes as well.²² In 1880 the State Grange protested against the quality of teachers employed in the schools and attributed the selection of inefficient teachers to the incompetency of county superintendents.²³ Some Grangers, in their desire to increase the efficiency of schools, even overcame their predilection for economy and low taxes. One group went so far as to support an eight-month school term.²⁴ Bowling Green Grangers were in favor of raising the poll tax to \$2.00 so that additional educational costs might be met.²⁵ By 1887 the attitude of the Grange was such that one chapter in recommending general retrenchment to the legislature stipulated that the schools were not to be hurt.²⁶

One of the objects of the Granger attack was the stereotyped curriculum of the public schools. Many farmers could not see the connection between the study of philosophy, for instance, and the techniques of farming. Consequently, Grange leaders, and especially State Master Putnam Darden, advocated changes in the curriculum in order to intro-

²⁰ Raymond *Hinds County Gazette*, June 27, 1877.

²¹ *Ibid.*, June 14, 1876; Jackson *Weekly Clarion*, January 9, 1878; Mississippi *Laws*, 1878, pp. 89-115; Noble, *Forty Years of Public Schools*, 50-60.

²² Bowling Green (Mississippi) Grange Minutes (in Mississippi Department of Archives and History, Jackson), August 19, 1876.

²³ Columbus *Patron of Husbandry*, January 8, 1881; January 6, 1883.

²⁴ *Ibid.*, July 16, 1881; Raymond *Hinds County Gazette*, October 11, 1876.

²⁵ Holmes County (Mississippi) Grange Minutes (in Mississippi Department of Archives and History, Jackson), October 8, 1885; Bowling Green Grange Minutes, October 17, 1885.

²⁶ Holmes County Grange Minutes, October 13, 1887.

duce technical training. The State Grange repeatedly petitioned the legislature to require schools to teach courses in elementary principles of agriculture and in domestic science.²⁷ This objective was finally achieved in 1903, when the State Teachers Association secured action on a recommendation that a course in elementary principles of agriculture be taught in the public schools.²⁸

In a few cases Grangers organized their own private schools and in these taught the principles of agriculture. Hinds County Grange planned to set up a high school in Raymond in 1874.²⁹ There is no evidence that the project materialized. There were, however, at least two Grange schools in Jefferson County. One was located at "Bermuda Ridge," the plantation home of Putnam Darden.³⁰ Among the laws passed at the 1878 session of the legislature was an act incorporating the Grange Agricultural School of Coahoma County.³¹ It is probable that these schools bore similarities to the county agricultural high schools set up after the turn of the century.

The efforts of the Grange to promote education were directly responsible for the establishment of present-day Mississippi State College. Agitation for a purely agricultural and mechanical school grew out of farmers' displeasure with the state's use of the land script made available by the Congressional act of July 2, 1862.³² To provide education for white farmers, the state legislature had appropriated income from two fifths of the script to a new agricultural department in the University of Mississippi. Even though Dr. Martin W. Philips, a scientific agricultural writer of note, was made head of the University farm, few

²⁷ *Columbus Patron of Husbandry*, December 27, 1879; January 8, July 16, 1881; January 21, 1882; January 6, 1883.

²⁸ Ronald J. Slay, *The Development of the Teaching of Agriculture in Mississippi with Special Emphasis on Agriculture as a Part of School Curricula* (New York, 1928), 79-80.

²⁹ *Raymond Hinds County Gazette*, October 7, 1874.

³⁰ Historical Records Survey, WPA, "Source Material for Mississippi History," 82 vols. (1936-1938), "Jefferson County," 2 pts. (1936-1938), II, 67. This material is in the Mississippi Department of Archives and History, Jackson.

³¹ *Jackson Weekly Clarion*, January 30, 1878; *Columbus Patron of Husbandry*, April 23, 1881.

³² *Report of the Trustees, President and Other Officers of the Agricultural and Mechanical College of Mississippi, From the Organization of the College to December 1st, 1883* (Jackson, 1883), 4.

students enrolled for the course and it was dropped by the institution in 1876.³³

Grangers felt that farmers were not getting the greatest possible services from the money available. They expressed a desire for a school that the sons of poor farmers might attend.³⁴ For a while the order considered setting up an agricultural college as a private venture.³⁵ Deeming this inadvisable, the Grange then turned to the legislature. In 1876 a petition from the State Convention asked that funds be appropriated for an agricultural college.³⁶ The next year a Granger introduced a bill into the legislature providing for the establishment of a college.³⁷ It failed then, but the State Grange that met in December of that year made a particularly strong demand for an agricultural school.³⁸ The request bore fruit in the next session of the legislature. In spite of strong opposition from the economy wing, the college was chartered on February 28, 1878, as the Mississippi Agricultural and Mechanical College, and a board of trustees was selected to choose a site for the institution.³⁹

There was much public interest in the school. Various farmers offered suggestions as to what subjects should be taught. Nearly all insisted that the charges for attending the school should be placed at a low figure.⁴⁰ The college was located at Starkville, and General Stephen D. Lee, a Confederate veteran, was made president.⁴¹ Its practical, agricultural curriculum seemingly attracted large numbers of students. Almost from its first session in 1880, the school had an enrollment so large that students had to be turned away. Low fees and numerous opportu-

³³ *Ibid.*, 12; James M. White, "Origin and Location of the Mississippi A. & M. College," in *Publications of the Mississippi Historical Society*, III (1900), 345; William F. Bozeman, "Martin Wilson Philips, Mississippi Planter" (M.A. thesis, Louisiana State University, 1937), 19-21.

³⁴ Jackson *Weekly Clarion*, January 16, 1878.

³⁵ *Ibid.*, September 17, 1874; Mississippi State Grange *Proceedings*, V, 15.

³⁶ Raymond *Hinds County Gazette*, January 2, 31, 1877.

³⁷ Jackson *Weekly Clarion*, April 24, 1878.

³⁸ *Ibid.*, January 2, 1878; Raymond *Hinds County Gazette*, January 9, 1878.

³⁹ Mississippi *Laws*, 1878, pp. 118-23; Jackson *Weekly Clarion*, February 13, 1878.

⁴⁰ Raymond *Hinds County Gazette*, February 20, 1878; Jackson *Weekly Clarion*, May 22, July 10, 1878.

⁴¹ Columbus *Patron of Husbandry*, June 26, October 30, 1880.

nities for part-time work allowed many poor farmers to send their sons for training.⁴²

The Grange was proud of its part in establishing Mississippi Agricultural and Mechanical College. It continued its support by leading the fight for subsequent appropriations for the school.⁴³ Education committees for local granges recommended the college to the sons of their members.⁴⁴ Grange officials called on the faculty to conduct farmers' institutes for them.⁴⁵ They likewise asked that the college chemist be made state analyzer of commercial fertilizers.⁴⁶ In turn, the contributions of the Grange to the school were recognized by the college officials. The trustees, many of whom were Grangers, repeatedly requested the State Grange to hold its sessions on the school's campus and promised to co-operate at all times in everything pertaining to farmer education.⁴⁷ There is today on the campus of Mississippi State College a monument to Putnam Darden, State Master of the Grange. Although it was placed there by the National Patrons of Husbandry, its location on the campus is an indication of the close relationship between the school and the order he headed.⁴⁸

The Grange believed in providing women with educational facilities equal to those available to men. Having brought about the establishment of a technical school for men, the organization now set out to secure an industrial school for women. Various state conventions, especially those of 1881 and 1882, passed resolutions stating that women needed a school to give them business training.⁴⁹ A Granger introduced an unsuccessful bill into the 1882 legislature to provide a separate college for women. Mrs. Annie C. Peyton, who for years had cham-

⁴² *Ibid.*, March 4, 1882; *Report of Trustees . . . of Agricultural and Mechanical College, 1883*, pp. 7-10.

⁴³ *Columbus Patron of Husbandry*, December 27, 1879; March 13, 1880.

⁴⁴ Holmes County Grange Minutes, January 8, 1885; October 14, 1886.

⁴⁵ *Ibid.*, July 10, 1884; Bowling Green Grange Minutes, December 19, 1885.

⁴⁶ *Columbus Patron of Husbandry*, January 21, 1882; *Report of Trustees . . . of Agricultural and Mechanical College, 1883*, p. 13.

⁴⁷ *Columbus Patron of Husbandry*, January 6, 1883.

⁴⁸ Nannie H. Rice, Librarian of Mississippi State College, to James S. Ferguson, September 10, 1941. This letter is in the possession of the writer.

⁴⁹ *Columbus Patron of Husbandry*, January 21, 1882; January 6, 1883.

pioned the cause of female education, wrote to Darden that the bill had been defeated by the lobbyists for private schools. She entreated the Grange to continue its efforts.⁵⁰ A bill was passed in 1884 to establish the Industrial Institute and College for women. The school, which was eventually located at Columbus,⁵¹ was the first of its kind in the United States. It gave training in teaching, telegraphy, stenography, sewing, and many other technical fields.⁵² Grangers proudly recommended the school. Its president at times attended Grange meetings to give lectures on the work done by the institution.⁵³

The educational work of the Grange that reached the largest number of people was the instruction that it gave through newspapers, programs, and institutes. These were the avenues through which the adult membership was influenced. Different comments tended to show how much the order stressed this type of educational work. One writer defined the Grange as a group that "establishes in every neighborhood a lecture room, which is the Grange itself."⁵⁴ An education committee, although it "lamented the lack of education," reported that members thought their most useful training had been obtained in the Grange.⁵⁵

The monthly or fortnightly meeting of the local grange was the hub of the practical educational program. In these sessions the people of the community were brought together to share their thoughts and their facts to the benefit of all. Meetings were conducted in a strictly parliamentary manner. This in itself was valuable training to the unlettered farmer and enabled him, one writer said, to take his place in public life alongside those of the so-called white-collar professions.⁵⁶ A Granger might bring up in these meetings any subject that he chose to

⁵⁰ *Ibid.*, January 6, 1883.

⁵¹ *Mississippi Laws*, 1884, pp. 50-55; Jackson, (Mississippi) *State Ledger*, August 29, September 12, 1884.

⁵² *Report of the President of the Industrial Institute and College for the Education of White Girls of Mississippi* (Jackson, 1886), 8-10.

⁵³ *Ibid.*, 15. The school is now known as the Mississippi State College for Women.

⁵⁴ *Jackson Weekly Clarion*, August 28, 1873.

⁵⁵ Holmes County Grange Minutes, July 13, 1882.

⁵⁶ *Newton Weekly Ledger*, January 28, 1875; *By-Laws of the State Grange of Mississippi* (2nd ed., Jackson, 1872), 15. This pamphlet is in the Library of the Wisconsin Historical Society, Madison. A microfilmed copy was used.

espouse or attack. Bowling Green Grange formed the policy of having each of its members drop into a "Query Box" a paper listing his major topics of interest. Then, in subsequent meetings individual Grangers were assigned the preparation of papers dealing with the subjects. A few of the topics discussed were: "What Has the Credit System Done for the Farmer?"; "Comparative Merits of Rail and Wire Fences"; and "What Would Be a Just and Equitable Tariff?"⁵⁷

Participation in these programs brought out the latent talents of some farmers. "Plow Handles" wrote in 1877 that he had heard public speeches by Grangers who four years before could not get out an audible "Mr. Speaker."⁵⁸ Another correspondent saw the monthly grange meeting as a supplement to the public schools. "Great care," he reported, "has been given to the habit of . . . clear, distinct and effective reading" and to the development of "orderly thinking."⁵⁹

A regularly elected officer in the Grange was the lecturer, who was called on from time to time to deliver talks on some phase of farm life.⁶⁰ Of course, the value of such speeches varied with the speaker's competency. His work was sometimes supplemented by traveling lecturers.⁶¹ Putnam Darden almost yearly traveled over the state to address local granges. In addition he appointed deputy lecturers to assist him. Often the object of such tours was primarily the organization of new granges, but, nevertheless, farmers were doubtless aided by hearing agricultural lectures delivered by this group of men who usually were able and well-informed.⁶²

A measure of practical training was gained from the systematic way in which Grange business was conducted. For instance, before any expenditure could be made it had to be confirmed by the vote of the entire grange.⁶³ If a member wished to transfer to another chapter, he

⁵⁷ Bowling Green Grange Minutes, April 17, 1875; July 16, 1881; August 19, 1882; April 21, July 21, 1883.

⁵⁸ Raymond *Hinds County Gazette*, August 22, 1877.

⁵⁹ Newton *Weekly Ledger*, January 28, 1875.

⁶⁰ *By-Laws of State Grange of Mississippi*, 7, 20.

⁶¹ Columbus *Patron of Husbandry*, January 10, 1880; January 8, December 25, 1881.

⁶² *Ibid.*, June 21, 1879; June 24, 1882.

⁶³ Bowling Green Grange Minutes, November 15, 1873.

was first required to pay all back dues.⁶⁴ Members delinquent in dues for a year were expelled from the chapter.⁶⁵ At the end of each fiscal year, the secretary and treasurer were required to submit itemized statements of receipts and expenditures, which were then subjected to an audit.⁶⁶ All these activities emphasized to the individual Granger the importance of following a definite system of rules and encouraged him to apply this same system to his private business affairs.

A few local granges sought the cultural advancement of their members by setting up small libraries. E. G. Wall suggested in the *Jackson Farmer's Vindicator* that each grange should provide at least a few books to be kept in the Grange hall. Another editor wanted the National Grange to issue a preferred list of books.⁶⁷ Among the chapters which actually established libraries was Ebenezer Grange of Holmes County.⁶⁸ Perhaps this is one reason for the continued existence of that chapter after so many others had become dormant.

An important cog in Grange education was the newspaper. Members were encouraged to subscribe to publications friendly to the cause in order to keep posted on Grange news and at the same time gain other information that the paper contained. In its earliest days the Mississippi Grange adopted the policy of selecting an official publication. For several years the *Jackson Farmer's Vindicator*, edited by E. G. Wall, was the paper endorsed by the State Grange.⁶⁹ After Wall moved to New Orleans, the *Columbus Patron of Husbandry* became the official journal. In time that paper was officially adopted by six southern state granges.⁷⁰ It became bankrupt in 1883 and was supplanted as the foremost Grange paper by the *Meridian Farmer's Advocate*.⁷¹

There were other newspapers that represented the Grange either officially or unofficially. One of the editors of the *Jackson Weekly Clarion*

⁶⁴ *Ibid.*, February 19, 1876.

⁶⁵ *Ibid.*, February 17, 1877.

⁶⁶ *Ibid.*, March 20, 1875; Mississippi State Grange *Proceedings*, V, 14, 42.

⁶⁷ Newton *Weekly Ledger*, September 10, 1874.

⁶⁸ Holmes County Grange Minutes, July 14, 1887.

⁶⁹ Jackson *Weekly Clarion*, September 18, 1873.

⁷⁰ Columbus *Patron of Husbandry*, May 3, 1879; December 25, 1880.

⁷¹ Bowling Green Grange Minutes, April 21, 1883; September 20, 1884.

was Ethelbert Barksdale, a former Confederate congressman and an officer in the Capital Grange. Quite naturally, his paper supported Grange policies.⁷² Many papers made a practice of setting aside a number of columns as a "Grange Department." The Lexington *Advertiser* followed this plan and asked each local grange in its area to appoint an assistant editor to report news to be printed in the special columns.⁷³

It is probable that many farmers who had never before subscribed to newspapers did so because of Grange encouragement. One campaign for subscriptions to the Columbus *Patron of Husbandry* netted ninety-six new subscribers in Newton County alone, a remarkable figure when one considers that there were only about 1,550 white families in the county.⁷⁴ Bowling Green Grange was so eager to have its members read the *Patron of Husbandry* that it ordered five copies to be distributed among those families unable to buy the paper themselves.⁷⁵ The columns of the newspapers provided Grange leaders with excellent opportunities to encourage farmers to use scientific methods of agriculture.⁷⁶

When the Mississippi Agricultural and Mechanical College was established, the Board of Trustees ruled that the faculty should conduct at least six farmers' institutes each year.⁷⁷ In many instances these were held in conjunction with local granges, as was true in 1886 when an institute was held in Holmes County.⁷⁸

The best known and most widely attended of these institutes met in connection with a Grange encampment known as Patrons' Union. This organization, a joint project of some seven or more county granges, was located at Lake in Newton County. Once a year, usually in late July or early August, Grangers brought their families to Patrons' Union for a week of entertainment and instruction. There were located on the camp-

⁷² Jackson *Weekly Clarion*, October 1, 15, 1874.

⁷³ Bowling Green Grange Minutes, November 18, 1882.

⁷⁴ Columbus *Patron of Husbandry*, October 30, 1880; *Tenth Census of the United States, 1880, Statistics of Population* (Washington, 1883), 398, 669.

⁷⁵ Bowling Green Grange Minutes, January 21, 1882.

⁷⁶ A typical article contained in a Grange journal was entitled, "Whence Does a Plant Derive Its Food?" Columbus *Patron of Husbandry*, March 11, 1882.

⁷⁷ Slay, *Development of Teaching of Agriculture*, 63.

⁷⁸ Bowling Green Grange Minutes, December 19, 1885.

ground a large three-storied hotel and over fifty cottages. These facilities were not excessive, for the yearly attendance at the Union varied from 2,000 to 6,000.

The week of Patrons' Union was crowded with activities. Athletic contests and social events of all kinds, dancing excepted, provided recreational opportunities. On Sunday four or five ministers preached to the Grangers. In the early years of the Union one day was given over to a teachers' institute, which had as its purpose to bolster efficiency in public school instruction and management.

The major part of the week, however, was occupied with discussion of farm problems. A few individuals read papers and free debate on the subjects followed. The Union owned 120 acres of land which it used as an experimental farm, and part of the time was given over to the study of findings made in the experiments. The lectures of the faculty of the Agricultural and Mechanical College took up at least one day. The Mississippi Horticultural Society usually met in conjunction with Patrons' Union and a day was devoted to its program. The sessions were interspersed with music, declamation contests, and dramatic events, in which the young people participated. All in all the Grange family had a full week at Patrons' Union.⁷⁹

The training received by farmers at the Union was apparently of great benefit. At any rate, the organization did seem to stimulate interest in the Grange, for the order lingered on in East Mississippi after it had died out in many other areas. Patrons' Union, though it is no longer connected with the Grange, still exists. Its campground yearly attracts a number of visitors, but its sessions are now almost exclusively religious.

The principles brought out in Grange agencies led toward the central objective of making farming more profitable. This was to be effected by six practices: diversification of crops in order to produce supplies needed on the farm; reduction of cotton acreage, which would raise the price of cotton and make diversification possible; improvement of tech-

⁷⁹ A. J. Brown, *History of Newton County, Mississippi* (Jackson, 1894), 224-39; Jackson *State Ledger*, July 9, 1887; Jackson *Daily Clarion-Ledger*, July 9, August 2, 1890; August 2, 1893; July 22, 1898.

niques in order to increase production per acre; application of strict economy to farm buying to keep down store accounts; use of systematic methods in conducting farm affairs; and encouragement of home industries so that manufactured goods might be bought at cheaper prices.

The first of these, diversification and raising of one's own supplies, was dwelt upon more often and with more emphasis than was any other topic. It was pointed out that dependence upon others for supplies bound the farmer to the merchant and kept him continually in debt. Too, if farmers diversified, they were no longer dependent on only one crop. Grange editors repeatedly praised farmers who diversified their production.⁸⁰ Some granges conducted contests to stimulate the raising of supplies. A Winston County grange paid a premium of \$15 for the best hog raised, and \$25 for the best yield of corn per acre.⁸¹ Bowling Green Grange extended its rewards to the women who did the best sewing and weaving.⁸² Central Grange of Madison County added to the distinction of its premiums by presenting them at the annual fair held in Canton.⁸³

Cotton acreage reduction plans of the Grange presaged present-day practices under the Agricultural Adjustment Administration. The idea of restricting supply in order to drive up prices was the special interest of the Capital Grange, which sent a circular letter all over the South asking for co-operation in cutting acreage. The suggestion was greeted with praise but failed to produce any immediate results, largely because each farmer favored reduction primarily in the cotton acreage planted by his neighbor.⁸⁴

It is interesting to note that Grangers recommended to the legislature and actually introduced a bill to prohibit the sale of cotton seed, the purpose being to keep the seed on the farm where they would be valuable as fertilizer.⁸⁵ This was but one of the large number of meas-

⁸⁰ Raymond *Hinds County Gazette*, April 22, 1874.

⁸¹ Newton *Weekly Ledger*, July 2, 1874.

⁸² Bowling Green Grange Minutes, June 17, 1876.

⁸³ Jackson *Weekly Clarion*, September 17, 1874.

⁸⁴ *Ibid.*, October 29, 1874; Newton *Weekly Ledger*, February 11, 1875; Raymond *Hinds County Gazette*, May 28, 1879.

⁸⁵ Jackson *Weekly Clarion*, January 23, 1878; Raymond *Hinds County Gazette*, May 28, 1879; Columbus *Patron of Husbandry*, October 15, 1879.

ures advocated to encourage the farmer to improve and conserve his soil. Professor D. L. Phares, a Granger, wrote newspaper articles and one book on the soil-building qualities of clover and lespedeza.⁸⁶ Methods of preventing soil erosion by the construction of dams and terraces were described at length in Grange papers.⁸⁷

To keep down debts, Grangers dedicated themselves to retrenchment in their buying. One group of women agreed to wear calico dresses for all occasions until "store accounts shall have gone."⁸⁸ Leaders admonished Grangers to stay out of debt in so far as possible, and to keep orderly records of purchases whenever credit buying was absolutely necessary.⁸⁹ This practice would protect the farmer from dishonest bookkeeping and at the same time give him figures from which he could compute his cost of production.

With the hope of promoting self-sufficiency further, Grangers suggested the establishment of a few factories that would produce the manufactured goods needed in Mississippi. At least two granges operated successful co-operative tanning yards.⁹⁰ W. H. Worthington, editor of the *Patron of Husbandry*, wanted the Grange to set up co-operative cotton mills that would utilize the Clement Attachment. This machine was an invention that combined the ginning and weaving processes, supposedly at a saving of \$12.15 a bale. Before any grange in Mississippi adopted the use of the attachment, it had proven to be impractical and had been discarded.⁹¹

From the standpoint of immediate results, the Grange's program of self-sufficiency was disappointing. A few Grangers attained a local reputation for being "practical farmers."⁹² As late in the Granger period as 1894, however, Charles H. Otken in *The Ills of the South* was still

⁸⁶ Jackson *Weekly Clarion*, April 24, 1878; May 21, 1879; Columbus *Patron of Husbandry*, August 6, 1881.

⁸⁷ Raymond *Hinds County Gazette*, December 26, 1877.

⁸⁸ Newton *Weekly Ledger*, February 26, 1874.

⁸⁹ *Ibid.*, February 4, 1875.

⁹⁰ Raymond *Hinds County Gazette*, October 7, November 18, 1874.

⁹¹ Columbus *Patron of Husbandry*, November 22, 1879; Harriet L. Herring, "The Clement Attachment: An Episode of Reconstruction Industrial History," in *Journal of Southern History* (Baton Rouge, 1935-), IV (1938), 185-98.

⁹² Raymond *Hinds County Gazette*, April 22, 1874; April 9, 1879.

scolding farmers for not raising their own food.⁹³ Even today it is seldom that a farmer is found in Mississippi who produces all or even most of the supplies that he needs on his own place.

The reaction of the Grange to the agricultural depression of post-bellum days, then, took two forms. Some leaders attributed farm troubles to business oppression and directed their efforts toward curbing monopolies. Others—and these prevailed over a long period of time—made a constructive attack upon economic ills by emphasizing that the farmer could help himself through formal and practical education.

In the field of formal education Mississippi Grangers at times supported an economizing program. Their primary interest, however, was in securing a school program that would give training applicable to business life. The inclusion of the study of agricultural principles and domestic science in the public school curriculum was one step toward that goal, but the most tangible progress toward providing technical training was achieved in the establishment of Mississippi Agricultural and Mechanical College and in the founding of an industrial school for women.

In its informal educational program, one of the greatest contributions of the Grange was that it gave a medium of expression to individuals who never before had had an opportunity of developing their talents. Of course, the order's success in getting farmers to adopt scientific methods is difficult to measure. No great effect of its work was immediately discernible. It is probable, however, that Grange promotion of diversification had a measure of influence toward making the practice more popular at the present time. At any rate, it seems justifiable to say that, taken as a whole, the Grange's contribution to farmer education was a positive one.

⁹³ Charles H. Otken, *The Ills of the South* (New York, 1894), 57, 97-120.

Was Plantation Slavery Profitable?

BY THOMAS P. GOVAN

The debate over the profitableness of slavery has been going on, in one form or another, for almost one hundred and fifty years.¹ It is, perhaps, too late for a definitive settlement of the question because of the destruction of so much of the evidence, but there can be an attempt at a reconciliation of the conflicting conclusions of the various students who have written about it.

The argument, too frequently, has been concerned with the question of whether or not slave labor was as profitable as free? Or, could a planter who made money with slaves have made more if he had employed free workers? These are interesting questions for speculation, but hardly more, because materials for a comparison do not exist. An experiment to test their truth or falsity probably could not have been made in the ante-bellum South where slavery appears to have been not so much an economic system as a social order to permit two unlike peoples to live together.² At least it does not seem to have been tried. Comparisons between free labor farms in the North and West and slave plantations of the South are of little value because of the widely varying climatic conditions, the nature of the crops, and other circumstances.

¹ Research on this article was made possible through grants from the Julius Rosenwald Fund and the Social Science Research Council.

² E. Merton Coulter (ed.), Ulrich B. Phillips, *The Course of the South to Secession, An Interpretation* (New York, 1939), 152; Dwight L. Dumond, *Antislavery Origins of the Civil War in the United States* (Ann Arbor, 1939), 52; Clement Eaton, *Freedom of Thought in the Old South* (Durham, 1940), 174-75; Ralph H. Gabriel, *The Course of American Democratic Thought* (New York, 1940), 108-109.

Similarly profits of a plantation before and after emancipation could hardly be compared because of the vastly different conditions in the two periods.

But if the question is narrowed to the particular one of whether the planters of the Old South were making money from their operations, there is still no agreement to be found among the writers on southern agriculture. Ulrich B. Phillips concluded that by the close of the 1850's it was "fairly certain that no slaveholders but those few whose plantations lay in the most advantageous parts of the cotton and sugar districts and whose managerial ability was exceptionally great were earning anything beyond what would cover their maintenance and carrying charges."³ Lewis C. Gray, expressly denying Phillips's conclusion, wrote, "Far from being a decrepit institution, the economic motives for the continuance of slavery from the standpoint of the employer were never so strong as in the years just preceding the Civil War."⁴

The same contradictions are to be found among ante-bellum observers. Solon Robinson, the noted agricultural reformer, published a report of his observations at the plantation of Colonel L. M. Williams of Society Hill, South Carolina. The profits of the plantation, according to this statement, were very low. But the editor of the *Columbia South Carolinian*, in complete disagreement, took the same figures and proved that the profits were very large.

Robinson, in his statement, valued the plantation's 4,200 acres (2,700 of which were in cultivation) at \$63,000 or \$15 per acre; 254 slaves at \$88,900 or \$350 each; and other assets including livestock, plantation tools, and equipment at \$8,502; making a total of \$160,402. Expenses amounted to \$17,894.48 and included the following: interest at 7 per cent on the investment in land, slaves, and livestock (but not on the investment in tools and equipment), totaling \$11,103; taxes on slaves and land; medical care; wages of three overseers; average expenditures for iron, tools, and equipment (the equivalent of depreciation); shoes, hats, and clothing; molasses, tobacco, and salt; and freight, commission,

³ Ulrich B. Phillips, *American Negro Slavery* (New York, 1918), 391-92.

⁴ Lewis C. Gray, *History of Agriculture in the Southern United States to 1860*, 2 vols. (Washington, 1933), I, 476.

and other costs of selling and shipping cotton. The plantation produced 331,136 pounds of cotton. Its income from other sources amounted to \$2,430, so that the average cost of a pound of cotton was 4.07 cents. Had this cotton sold at 6 cents, Robinson concluded, the profits would have been \$1,973.68, at 7 cents, \$5,385.04, which was about what it brought, being a little more than 3 per cent.⁵

The editor of the *South Carolinian*, however, completely rejected Robinson's conclusions. First he protested against the uniform valuation of all land at \$15 per acre when 1,500 acres were not in cultivation. The plantation did not need more than 750 acres of unimproved land for wood lot, grazing, etc., so that the remaining 750 acres were not, according to the writer, a legitimate part of the plantation. This reduced the real capital by \$11,250 to \$150,152. "But," continued the editor:

the most glaring inconsistency which our agricultural tourist exhibits in calculating the profits of a business investment, is in adding the item of interest upon capital as expense. A person investing money in any enterprise is justly considered to be doing a fair business if he makes a small percentage over interest and expenses; and the statement which Mr. Robinson furnishes of Col. Williams's plantation, only proves that our fellow-citizen makes about 12½ per cent. on his capital, and that too with the price of cotton placed as low as six cents in *Charleston*—for freight and commission are included in the table of "expenses."

. . . we deny the principle of adding interest on capital, as part of the expenses, when the object is to find out the profits upon that capital. . . . Mr. Robinson calculates interest upon the cost of the stock of the plantation, which is obviously fallacious and deceptive, where its natural increase must amount to more than the interest. . . . He omits to add to the income of the plantation the natural increase of the labor employed thereon—an item which is always prominent in the planter's calculation, and which would unquestionably amount to 5 or 6 per cent. per annum upon their original cost. And . . . he has certainly neglected the

⁵ James D. B. De Bow, *The Industrial Resources, etc., of the Southern and Western States*, 3 vols., (New Orleans, 1853), I, 161-64; D. Lee, "Cotton," in *Report of the Commissioner of Patents for the Year, 1849*, Part II, *Agriculture* (Washington, 1850), 307-13; Ralph B. Flanders, *Plantation Slavery in Georgia* (Chapel Hill, 1933), 221-22. There are several errors of calculation in the various reprintings of Robinson's report which account for the discrepancies in the figures used by different writers quoted here and subsequently.

increased value arising from the yearly improvement of a well cultivated plantation. . . . The result then, according to our views, will be as follows:

Capital invested, \$150,152.00	
Income of the farm	
331,136 lbs. cotton, at 6 cents	\$19,868.16
Bacon and other provisions	2,430.00
Increase of negroes, say 5 per cent., set down as capital \$89,000	4,495.00
	<hr/> 26,793.16
The annual expenses of the farm, as itemized by Mr. Robinson, a full estimate, including freight and commission,	
	6,791.48
Net profit of capital invested	<hr/> \$20,001.68

These profits amount to over *thirteen per cent. per annum* over all expenses—the *Charleston* price of cotton being only put down at 6 cents. Suppose the crop averaged eight cents in Charleston, as it would do at the present time, the profits would be \$26,614.40, or nearly 18 per cent.⁶

Thus, two contemporary observers, using essentially the same figures, arrive at quite different results. One said profit for the year was only \$1,973.68, while the other was equally certain that it was \$20,001.68. Paradoxically, both were essentially correct, because each meant something different when he wrote of profit. "Perhaps no term or concept in economic discussion is used with a more bewildering variety of well established meanings than profit," Frank H. Knight, a modern economist, has stated.⁷

Solon Robinson, probably following the definition of Jean-Baptiste Say,⁸ the French nineteenth-century economist, apparently considered profit as mere wages of management. Almost all classical economists "recognized at least three elements in the income of the capitalist entre-

⁶ De Bow, *Industrial Resources*, I, 163-64. Dr. D. Lee also questioned the validity of Robinson's calculations, saying, "The above estimates are defective and erroneous. . . . No allowance is made . . . for the increase in number and value of the slaves in the course of a year. If this is not equal to 7 per cent. on an average, it is to 3½ per cent., and sometimes reaches 8 or 10 per cent."

⁷ Frank H. Knight, "Profit," in *Encyclopaedia of the Social Sciences*, 15 vols. (New York, 1930-35), XII, 480-87.

⁸ Jean-Baptiste Say apparently was widely read and very influential in the United States. His *A Treatise on Political Economy or the Production, Distribution, and Consumption of Wealth* was highly recommended by Thomas Jefferson, who edited the work for American

preneur: one a payment for the bare use of the capital (equal to the interest rate); a second element representing payment for the entrepreneur's activities as manager; and a third connected in a rather vague way with the carrying of the risks or hazards of the enterprise." Most of them, however, continued to apply the term profit to the combination of the three elements of the proprietor's income. But Say insisted "on a separation between profit and interest and the treatment of profit as a species of wage."⁹

The editor of the *South Carolinian*, however, was not writing of economic profit. He was writing as an ordinary businessman or farmer according to the most generally accepted definition of profit, that of accounting. To him, the entire net income of the proprietor, after the deduction of all expenses, including depreciation and loss of value of assets, was profit.

Unfortunately, Robinson does not seem to have completely realized the meaning of his profit figure. He acted upon the definition of profit as wages of management, deducting interest upon investment as a cost of doing business, but he then assumed that there was a relation between the profit figure and the planter's investment. Actually there was no connection between the two. And when Robinson said that if the cotton were sold at seven cents, the profit would be \$5,385.04, or about 3 per cent on the investment, he was merely saying that Colonel Williams' wages for managing the plantation were the equivalent of a 3 per cent return on his capital. The total income of Colonel Williams from the plantation during the year, by Robinson's statement, was \$16,488.04, a 7 per cent return on his investment, or \$11,103, plus \$5,385.04, wages for management.

If this deduction or charge for "interest on investment" had been called "profit on investment," which would be equally accurate, Robinson's statement would not have been so completely misinterpreted by

publication in 1817. Five editions were printed and sold between 1817 and 1834, when the sixth edition was issued. Subsequently there was a new American edition in 1855. See Richard Hofstadter, "Parrington and the Jeffersonian Tradition," in *Journal of the History of Ideas* (New York, 1940-), II (1941), 396-97.

⁹ Knight, "Profit," in *Encyclopaedia of the Social Sciences*, XII, 481.

one modern student, who, in his rewriting of it, said, "The *cash expenditures* totalled \$17,879.48, and included the following: interest on capital at 7 per cent."¹⁰ This interest, it must be repeated, was not an expenditure of the planter, but was part of his income.

Most of the modern historians who deny the profitableness of slavery seem to confuse profit, as defined by Say and those who follow him, with the ordinary conception of profit used by businessmen and farmers. None of these historians, so far as can be ascertained from their studies, have used the rather elaborate financial statistics in the census of 1850 and 1860; or, at least, they have made no attempt to reconcile the conflict between their low estimates of profit from plantation operation and the overwhelming indication of a large increase of wealth in the South between 1850 and 1860.

Selected figures¹¹ for thirteen of the slave states, excluding rather arbitrarily Missouri and Delaware, show this increase very clearly:

	1850	1860
Number of farms	508,680	665,417
Total improved acres in farms	51,451,040	67,478,629
Average improved acres in farms	101.15	101.41
Total unimproved acres in farms	118,612,338	156,996,549
Average unimproved acres per farm	233.32	235.94
Average size of farms	334.47	337.35
Total cash value of farms	\$1,035,544,075.	\$2,288,179,125.
Average cash value of farms	\$2,035.75	\$3,438.71
True value of real and personal property	\$2,809,875,462.	\$6,245,129,163.
True value of real and personal property per capita—whites and free Negroes	\$490.49	\$878.08
Total number of slaveholders	326,054	358,728
Total number of slaves	3,110,652	3,833,782
Average number of slaves per slaveholder	9.54	10.69

¹⁰ Flanders, *Plantation Slavery in Georgia*, 221. Italics mine.

¹¹ Compiled from: James D. B. De Bow, *Statistical View of the United States . . . Being a Compendium of the Seventh Census* (Washington, 1854), 82, 95, 169; *The Seventh Census of the United States, 1850* (Washington, 1853), xxxiii; *The Eighth Census of the United States, 1860*, 4 vols. (Washington, 1864-1866), II, *Agriculture* (1864), vii, 222, 247-48; Joseph C. D. Kennedy, *Preliminary Report on the Eighth Census, 1860* (Washington, 1862), 195.

Many objections to these figures can be raised. They were collected by the marshals of the various districts and many of them may be inaccurate. Some of these figures lump slaveholders and nonslaveholders together, while others combine rural and urban wealth without distinction. Nevertheless, they are the most complete and accurate now available. Fortunately, however, the manuscript returns of individuals for 1850 and 1860 have in many instances been preserved. From these Dr. Herbert Weaver has studied the individual fortunes of five hundred persons engaged in agriculture in Jefferson and Jones counties, Mississippi. Two hundred and three of these men were nonslaveholders, and the remainder slaveholders, in 1850. In reporting the results of his investigation, he stated:

The only items checked were number of slaves, amount of improved and unimproved land owned, and the value of farms. By thus tracing individuals through a ten year period, the great prosperity enjoyed by all groups was established beyond all doubt. In practically every case there was an increase in every column. Slaveholdings, if they were slaveholders, showed a decided upward trend, and numerous nonslaveholders were found to own slaves in 1860. . . . Landholding increased . . . , but . . . it seems that the value of the land increased more than the acreage. A part of this was certainly due to a general increase in valuation of land, but the increase was too great to be attributed entirely to that fact. A great part of the increase in value represented increased acreage and improvements. Landholdings increased by about fifty per cent throughout the state, but the value of farms increased more than three fold.¹²

These figures from the census reports and the manuscript returns do not prove that slavery on southern plantations was profitable in its last decade but they do indicate this conclusion strongly enough to place the burden of proof upon those who deny that planters were making profits. Ulrich B. Phillips did not present any direct evidence on this problem but merely stated his own belief that slavery probably was not profitable in the late 1850's. He did not bear this out by citing figures based upon the actual experience of plantation owners, or upon contemporary estimates in newspapers or periodicals. Apparently his principal interest

¹² Herbert Weaver, "The Agricultural Population of Mississippi, 1850-1860" (Ph.D. dissertation, Vanderbilt University, 1941), 121-25.

was not in the profits of the plantation owner but in comparing the cost of slave and free labor.¹³

The most complete and comprehensive attempt to estimate the profits of plantation slavery is to be found in *Slavery in Mississippi* (1933) by Charles S. Sydnor. In this he has prepared a profit and loss statement, based on average figures from a large number of plantations, which indicates a very small rate of return for plantation owners and advances Professor Sydnor's doubt of the profitability of slavery. This statement, however, is open to so many objections and questions that a detailed and critical analysis seems appropriate. In his statement, Professor Sydnor said:

The chief source of income would be from cotton. Probably thirty of the fifty negroes worked in the field. If those produced 5¾ bales each, there would be a total of 158 bales which, at ten cents a pound, would be worth	\$6,320.00
The expenses of the plantation would be as follows:	
50 negroes at \$600 each (in the late 'fifties the price was higher) represented an investment of \$30,000. Calculating interest at 6 per cent, this amounted to	\$1,800.00
At least an equal amount should be added for depreciation in slave property by accidents, deaths, old age, etc.	1,800.00
As the average hand worked about twelve acres, 600 acres would be ample for pastures and woodland as well as fields. Allowing \$10 per acre, the investment in land at 6 per cent interest involved a yearly carriage charge of	360.00
and it ordinarily depreciated at the rate of at least three per cent a year in value	180.00
Annual hire of an overseer, at least.	300.00
Purchases from New Orleans or elsewhere of negro clothing, miscellaneous plantation supplies, etc. . . .	1,000.00
Without including various miscellaneous expenditures, such as the purchase of corn and pork, of	

¹³ Phillips, *American Negro Slavery*, 344-401; *id.*, "The Economic Cost of Slaveholding," in *Political Science Quarterly* (New York, 1886-), XX (1905), 257-75.

which few plantations produced enough, the total of the expenses and interest charges was	\$5,440.00
Profit of the planter	<hr/> 880.00 ¹⁴

From these figures Louis Hacker, in the *Triumph of American Capitalism* (1940), drew the conclusion that the hypothetical planter made only 2 per cent on his invested capital. By the same reasoning a man who lent money at 5 per cent would show a loss of 1 per cent because of the deduction of 6 per cent interest on investment.

Professor Sydnor, himself, understood that "interest on investment" was not an actual expense of the planter, because, as he said, the planter "was, of course, free to spend the interest on his investment in negroes and land, and this was the item that caused the profits from Mississippi plantations to appear high." He also stated that "the \$880 might be considered the wages of the planter for managing the enterprise,"¹⁵ but he never recognized that, according to many economists and the generally accepted definition of accountants and businessmen, profit is a combination of this interest on investment and wages for management.

Other objections must be made to the statement. In the chapter "Profitableness of Slavery," Professor Sydnor wrote, "Cotton, however, was not the only source of profit. A planter who barely made expenses by the sale of cotton might find his estate yearly increasing in value by the rearing of young negroes."¹⁶ This certainly seems true because there was a steady natural increase in the slave population during the entire ante-bellum period. In addition, the price of slaves tended generally upward except in years of financial crisis. Nevertheless, in his own estimate of plantation income, Professor Sydnor did not take this increase in value into account. Instead he deducted, as an expense, \$1,800 "for depreciation in slave property by accidents, deaths, old age, etc." It hardly seems correct to consider a working force which not only repro-

¹⁴ Charles S. Sydnor, *Slavery in Mississippi* (New York, 1933), 195-202. The income figure was not printed in the statement.

¹⁵ *Ibid.*, 197.

¹⁶ *Ibid.*, 198.

duced itself but increased in number, skill, and price, as a source of expense to the planter.

Similarly the expense figure of depreciation of land seems difficult to justify. At 3 per cent a year the land would be almost valueless after thirty-three years. But Mississippi land is still growing cotton. Unquestionably almost every crop takes something out of the land. But with equal certainty it can be said that the yearly work of the slaves, preparing the soil, ditching the fields, and clearing additional acres, aided fertility and increased value. This sometimes necessitated a cash expenditure for fertilizer or equipment, which would be a just charge to plantation expense; but it seems impossible now, with our limited and inadequate knowledge, to be certain whether there was a net gain or loss in value of land from the yearly plantation activity.

Professor Sydnor's estimate of the value of the planter's investment in land and slaves may also be questioned, because he seems to have assumed that the value of an asset is its market value at the particular moment.¹⁷ Prices, however, are the result of so many complex and unascertainable factors that they rarely can be taken as the equivalent of actual value. It is only under ideal circumstances that classical economists accept price as equal to value, and most other economists look on price as one of the evidences of value, not its exact expression.

Neither can the accountant accept this, because it would mean that assets fluctuate in value annually, which would introduce into the profit and loss statement a variable figure unrelated to the activities of the particular enterprise. A profit or loss (the equivalent of an increase or decrease in value of an asset) is usually not considered by an accountant

¹⁷ In another place Professor Sydnor says, "Since a fall in price of two dollars a slave would cause a drop of nearly a million dollars in the capital value of the slaves in the State, the profitableness of the institution depended largely on the price of slaves." This statement would not be accepted by an economist or an accountant, unless the owner was in the business of rearing slaves for sale, which few planters were; but, regardless of that, it has not even been considered by Professor Sydnor himself. If a fall in the price of slaves would result in a loss to the planter, then, in logic at least, an increase in price would give a profit to the planter. The price of slaves, according to Phillips, increased almost every year in the 1850's, but this profit, by Dr. Sydnor's own definition, is not included in the statement of plantation income. *Ibid.*, 201.

until it has been realized. Prices rise and fall for various reasons, and if these "paper" profits or losses from the unrealized increase or decrease of the market price of an asset were accepted as real, the actual profit or loss from operations during the accounting period would be obscured. For this reason an accountant usually values an asset at its cost, less depreciation, and not at its current market price.

Most of the land and slaves in the South did not change hands after 1849 and consequently the market price in the 1850's had little or nothing to do with their cost. Certainly a majority of the slaves had been reared by their owners, and their capital value as an asset was the cost of their rearing. There is no exact statistical information concerning the cost of rearing the slave, but it hardly could have amounted to Professor Sydnor's figure of \$600, which was based on market price in the early 1850's. This arbitrary capitalization of all slaves at the current market price introduces another element of uncertainty into the statement—again because of the deduction of "interest on investment." For if investment increases each year, with the rise in the price of slaves, the deduction from profit of "interest on investment" is also larger. Consequently the planter shows a decrease instead of an increase in profit from the raised capital value of his assets.

This "interest on investment," some economists say, is a cost of doing business, to others it is a part of profit; and there is also disagreement about how it is to be figured and what rate is to be charged. Some define it as the current rate of return. If it is, no entrepreneur, according to theory, could be expected to make more without attracting competitive capital into the same enterprise. It is also a virtually impossible task to ascertain the current rate of return during this period. Others say it is the current rate of interest on borrowed money. But this figure fluctuated widely with various individuals and sections of the South, and the information upon which to base an average is lacking. Still others insist that it is the so-called "pure" interest rate, the one yielded by the safest investment, but this would be more difficult to ascertain than either of the others. Phillips recommended that such a charge be made in figuring the cost of slave labor, but he made no estimate as to

what the rate should be. Sydnor who used 6 per cent and Robinson who used 7 per cent are alike in that they gave no reasons for their respective choices.

This difficulty in arriving at a satisfactory figure is one of the reasons why the financial accountant makes no use of interest on investment.¹⁸ Another is the technical impossibility of handling a deduction from profit that is neither an expenditure nor the decrease in value of an asset. But the chief argument against its use, is that it gives no information. It is merely the separation of the proprietor's income into two parts, interest upon investment, and profit above that interest. This is of little or no importance to the owner or the accountant, and of interest only to the economist who, in reality, is forced to guess as to the proper apportionment between the two.

If these objections to Professor Sydnor's statement are valid, the hypothetical planter seems to be somewhat better off. The results from his operations would be something like this:

Income from Cotton		\$6,320.00
Expenses:		
Annual hire of overseer	\$ 300.00	
Plantation supplies	1,000.00	1,300.00
Gross profit		<hr/> 5,020.00

¹⁸ There is a serious debate among cost accountants as to whether interest on investment has a proper place in that limited and specialized field of accounting. Some argue, as does Ulrich B. Phillips in his analysis of the cost of slave labor, "that the provision of capital is a necessary expense of a business just as is rent, insurance, or wages, and that it should be treated in the same manner as these expenses." But the majority seem to believe that the return on capital is not an expense but a profit, and the business world is accustomed so to consider it. As a result, to treat interest on investment as a cost of operation would produce financial statements which are misleading. William B. Lawrence, *Cost Accounting* (New York, 1925), 312-13; Roy B. Kester, *Advanced Accounting* (New York, 1933), 515-17; Phillips, "Economic Cost of Slaveholding," in *loc. cit.*, 268-69. Some cost accountants insist that interest on investment should be included "in order to determine what would be a fair profit in a given case," or "to determine whether it is better to manufacture or to buy goods in the open market, and whether it is better policy to manufacture by means of expensive machinery and other equipment or by manual labor." But even these suggest a technical arrangement whereby interest on investment is charged as a manufacturing expense to get manufacturing cost, but is then removed from the books before the net profit is arrived at, so that interest on investment is not shown in the financial statement at all. Jerome Lee Nicholson and John F. D. Rohrback, *Cost Accounting* (New York, 1919), 139-40; Kester, *Advanced Accounting*, 140.

This is the total of the money income and expenditure, though it was stated that no provision had been made for "miscellaneous expenditures such as the purchase of corn and pork, of which few plantations produced enough," and no consideration has been given to the various selling and transportation charges such as freight, insurance, packing costs, and factor's commissions.

It is not, however, a complete statement of the financial condition of the plantation, but it is almost all that can be known with any certainty. If the increase or decrease in value of assets is taken into consideration, so many approximations have to be used that the resulting figures are virtually without meaning. Each acre of land would have to be valued separately; its original cost ascertained; the loss of fertility from the year's crop, the increase in fertility from the year's work, and expenditures for fertilizer and equipment, would have to be balanced against each other; and the resulting figure be shown as income or expense, as the case might be. Obviously this could not be done with any degree of accuracy. Each slave would then have to be valued on the basis of his cost—the cost of rearing him to work age if born on the plantation, or his original purchase price—his physical condition, age, experience, and special training; and a balance struck as to his increase or decrease in value during the particular year. The totals of these increases or decreases in value would have to be added to or taken away from another figure which would show the net gain or loss from births and deaths of slaves. Only in this way could an accurate figure for a particular plantation be ascertained.

Most of this, however, is hypothetical, and cannot be ascertained from surviving records. It was seldom taken into consideration by the planters themselves who usually were content with the simplest records and figured profits or losses on the basis of cash income and expenditure. They, like the modern accountant, businessman, and farmer, considered their entire net income as profit, and made no attempt to divide it, according to classical theory, into interest on investment, wages of management, and compensation for risk.

If attention is turned to the actual results of plantation operations as

they are to be found in some surviving account books and papers, and in reports of contemporary newspapers and periodicals, no consistent pattern of profits is to be found. Cotton, rice, and tobacco, the staples of the South, were such speculative crops that there were wide variations in profit from plantation to plantation, and from year to year. For instance, in 1846-1847 on an Alabama plantation owned jointly by Mrs. R. Brown and Franklin H. Elmore, working 108 slaves and having an estimated value of \$70,000, the profits from the sale of 199 bales of cotton were \$7,352.40, or 10.5 per cent, with no direct superintendence by either of the proprietors.¹⁹ On the other hand, Farish Carter, one of the most successful Georgia planters, in 1851 made profits of \$1,530 on a plantation valued at \$150,000. This was a return of only 1¼ per cent on his investment.²⁰ In neither of these statements was credit taken or deduction made for the increase or decrease in value of slaves, the depreciation or appreciation of land, or any other intangible item.

Published estimates of the cost of growing cotton and of profits of plantations must be accepted with caution, particularly in the late 1840's and 1850's. During these years the merchants of Liverpool and the manufacturers of Manchester were protesting against the American monopoly of cotton production. The Cotton Supply Association was organized in Manchester with the openly avowed purpose of breaking the American domination of cotton supply by encouraging its growth in the colonies of the empire. Southern cotton growers and merchants, frightened by the possibility of increased competition, attempted to prove that the price of cotton was too low rather than too high, and that the profits from cotton planting had been grossly overstated.

One of these, who acknowledged his purpose, estimated that the gross profits from raising cotton on a well-equipped plantation with 100 slaves and valued at \$100,000 would amount only to \$1,750 with cotton selling at five cents a pound. But this, according to the writer, did not include anything "for the support of the planter . . . nor . . . to meet those contingent and incidental losses and costs . . . as the loss of

¹⁹ Gilmer & Company, Montgomery, to Franklin H. Elmore, Charleston, March 18, 1847, in Franklin H. Elmore MSS. (Division of Manuscripts, Library of Congress).

²⁰ Flanders, *Plantation Slavery in Georgia*, 222-23.

servants from epidemics, the loss of *whole teams* from diseases, the frequent accidents to gins and houses from fire, losses from overflows, breaking of levees, &c.”²¹ Another, writing in the *Soil of the South*, also said that the profits of cotton planting were overestimated, but was forced to admit that “there are more fortunes made at planting than at any other business.” His explanation of the paradox was that it was “attributable not to the supposed fact that there is more money made at the business than any other, but because planters are, as a class, more economical, and live more at home than any other.” He estimated that the average cost of raising 2,000 pounds of ginned cotton was \$160.16, or slightly over 8 cents a pound, but included, as part of cost, 7 per cent profit on the investment in slaves, land, and mules, or \$105.76.²²

One of the longest and most detailed records of a plantation which has been preserved is that of Hopeton on the Altamaha River in Glynn County, Georgia. This plantation was established before the War of 1812 by John Couper, a Scotsman, and remained in his possession until January 1, 1827. In a letter summarizing the results under his ownership, he said:

You know I commenced planting without capital. Of course had to go in debt and 8 per cent compound interest I found to be the real perpetual motion. Though tolerable successful sometimes, yet I had sad reverses—Embargo, non-intercourse & War—interfered with my prospects, whilst interest progressed—My loss of 60 prime effective negroes—carried off by the Enemy—lessened my annual income full \$15,000—to supply their places *in part* I bt. 120 slaves for which I paid an average of 450\$. Crops were not favorable. In the year 1824—I had *matured* a crop of 600 Bales cotton—which would have produced \$90,000—This was lost in 12 hours by hurricane. In 1825 I again nearly lost my crop by caterpillar. Cotton then sunk in price, without any prospect of improvement. Lands were reduced to $\frac{1}{3}$ of their value. Slaves to 250 or 200. In short I saw no hope of paying my debts and retaining my property—& tho not pushed—I thought best during my life to meet the storm. So to make a long story short—Mr. Hamilton being my principal creditor—on his agreeing to pay what other debts I owed—I surrendered to him all my property, debt, and dues of every description in a lump without valuation—except my lands on St. Simons and one

²¹ De Bow, *Industrial Resources*, I, 150-52.

²² “The Cost of a pound of Cotton,” in *De Bow's Review* (New Orleans, 1846-1880), XVIII (1855), 468-70.

hundred slaves—So on the 1st day of January 1827 I was thrown on the world without a dollar to support my people and family—Am glad to get off so well. Even though at a reasonable valuation the property I surrendered, was more than sufficient to pay my debts, yet had it been brought to a forced sale, it might have done less. I am satisfied and relieved from much anxiety. By this event neither my standing in society—nor my mode of living have suffered any change.²³

This reads as a confession of failure, but though John Couper suffered many grievous misfortunes, he had, by his own statement, begun planting without capital, and ended, after paying all his debts, with a plantation and 100 slaves, worth from fifty to a hundred thousand dollars. He had also, with a large family, lived in luxurious surroundings during most of the period, which is certainly no slight return from a lifetime devoted to planting.

John Couper had turned Hopeton over to his principal creditor, James Hamilton, a Scots merchant, and Hamilton in turn sold half of the plantation and 380 slaves to James H. Couper, son of John, for \$137,000 to be paid over a period of fifteen years at 6 per cent interest. Couper was to have the entire management for which he was to receive \$2,000 per year, the run of the plantation, and half the profits.²⁴ This arrangement continued until January 1, 1841, when Couper, to clear himself of debt, turned back his interest in the plantation to the Hamilton estate. After this, until 1852, Couper continued to manage the plantation for the estate. During the entire period of his management of the plantation from 1827 to 1852, he kept elaborate records of all phases of plantation operations including detailed financial information concerning receipts and expenditures.²⁵

From these records it is possible to establish year by year the cost value of the investment in the plantation, the gross and net sales, expenditures, and net profit. As the rate of profit varied widely from year to year it has seemed clearer to present the results in tabular form.

²³ John Couper, St. Simon's, to James Couper, Scotland, May 24, 1828, in John Couper MSS. (Southern Collection, University of North Carolina).

²⁴ *Ibid.*

²⁵ Hopeton Plantation Records (Southern Collection, University of North Carolina).

Year	Capital	Gross Sales	Net Sales	Expenses	Profit	Rate of Profit
1827	\$274,000.00	ns	\$4,367.19 $\frac{1}{2}$	\$12,239.56 $\frac{1}{4}$	\$7,871.76 $\frac{3}{4}$ ²⁶	
1828	294,895.22	ns	15,043.50	6,924.93	8,118.57	2.7%
1829	298,014.40	ns	11,707.08	9,021.95	2,685.13	.9
1830	298,014.40	ns	15,235.55	12,730.26	2,505.29	.8
1831	298,046.40	ns	22,482.34	16,949.10	5,533.24	1.85
1832	300,126.65	ns	17,030.23	10,910.86	6,119.37	2
1833	302,617.07	ns	22,016.37	10,937.07	11,079.30	3.6
1834	302,617.07	ns	20,609.24	9,918.72	10,690.52	3.5
1835	302,617.07	ns	26,897.48	11,857.64	15,039.84	4.9
1836	302,617.07	ns	31,977.27	8,452.16	23,525.11	7.7
1837	302,617.07	ns	45,970.72	9,868.87	36,101.85	11.9 ²⁷
1838	302,617.07	ns	35,889.13	12,939.44	22,949.69	7.2
1839	302,617.07	\$38,484.06	36,199.90	10,022.71	26,177.19	8
1840	302,617.07	26,476.34	24,228.01	11,276.11	12,951.90	4.2

The profits during these years were not large except in the years when the income from crops was supplemented by the hire of slaves to work on the Brunswick Canal. But the figures alone do not give the complete story.

As soon as James Couper took over the management of the plantation he began an experiment in sugar raising which turned out unsuccessfully. This not only caused an expenditure of \$22,443.82 for machinery in the first six years but also diverted a part of the labor force from other crops. This was not a foolish or reckless experiment, because sugar planters, under not unsimilar conditions in Louisiana, were making great fortunes, but it, apparently, was chiefly responsible for the low profits in the first few years.

As the plantation was turned back to the established crops, rice and sea-island cotton, the rate of profit began to increase to a more satisfactory figure. The statement of plantation expenses also appears to contain a substantial amount—the exact figure cannot be ascertained—for the personal and household expenses of Couper and his family.²⁸ It is to

²⁶ Deficit.

²⁷ In the three years 1837-1839, inclusive, the income of the plantation was increased by hire of slaves to the contractors building the Brunswick Canal: 1837, \$19,208.51; 1838, \$15,010.75; 1839, \$7,250.49.

²⁸ Hopeton Plantation Records. Couper seems to have kept exact records of his income

be remembered that as part of his compensation for management he had the use of house servants, horses, and boats, as well as produce for his table from his plantation. This was no inconsiderable item if the report of Sir Charles Lyell was correct. He visited the plantation in 1845 when conditions were probably the same as between 1827 and 1840. He described the separate villa maintained for Couper and his family on nearby St. Simon's Island, the library containing "Audubon's Birds, Michaud's Forest Trees, and other costly works on natural history," and then added:

Much has been said in praise of the hospitality of the southern planter, but they alone who have traveled in the southern states can appreciate the perfect ease and politeness with which a stranger is made to feel himself at home. Horses, carriages, boats, servants, are all at his disposal. Even his little comforts are thought of, and everything is done as heartily and naturally as if no obligations were conferred. . . .

The landed proprietors here visit each other in the style of English country gentlemen, sometimes dining out with their families and returning at night, or, if the distance be great, remaining to sleep and coming home the next morning. A considerable part of their food is derived from the produce of the land; but, as the houses are usually distant from large towns, they keep large stores of groceries and of clothing, as is the custom in country houses in some parts of Scotland.²⁹

These were real profits and must be considered, even if it is not possible to set a figure for them. At the same time the plantation was increasing, not decreasing, in value. No charge for depreciation on lands, or slaves, or other capital assets, was placed on Couper's books. He had not even written off as loss the cost of the unsuccessful experiment in sugar, but there was no need to. The year by year increase in value of the plantation more than offset these losses.

When Couper turned back his half interest in the plantation to the Hamilton estate on January 1, 1841, three commissioners were ap-

and expenditures, but his financial statements have not been preserved. In some instances it has been difficult to decide whether a given item should be charged as an expense or considered an increase of capital. It is not believed, however, that there were enough of these to affect the figures given above in any substantial way.

²⁹ Sir Charles Lyell, *A Second Visit to the United States of North America*, 2 vols. (New York, 1849), I, 244-46, 253, 254-55.

pointed by the Superior Court of Glynn County. These commissioners estimated the value of the plantation to be \$381,425, or an increase over original cost and additional investment of \$78,807.93. This represented a net gain in value of 26 per cent in fourteen years. This estimate, apparently, was too high for Couper and the trustees of the estate, and the actual transfer of title was made at a book value of \$342,481.88. The increase in value was \$39,864.81, or 13 per cent.³⁰

During the twelve years from 1840 to 1852 the plantation was owned by the Hamilton estate but managed by Couper, at a salary of \$5,000 a year for ten years and \$6,000 a year for two. The same arrangement in regard to household expenses that had been true during the first period appears also to have been in effect during the second and must be remembered in connection with the actual figures of profits. The 1840's were probably the worst decade, economically, in the agricultural history of the ante-bellum South, but the results of Couper's management, after deduction of his and the overseers' salaries, were as follows:

Year	Capital	Gross Sales	Net Sales	Expenses	Profit	Rate of Profit
1841	\$347,481.88	\$30,470.58	\$27,974.83	\$16,821.98	\$11,152.85	3.2%
1842	344,681.88	18,905.86	17,232.27	15,752.97	1,479.30	.43
1843	344,681.88	23,392.47	20,770.26	13,240.05	7,530.21	2.2
1844	344,181.88	30,411.03	27,699.58	17,259.71	10,439.87	3
1845	344,181.88	26,370.14	24,436.28	13,120.11	11,316.17	3.3
1846	344,181.88	41,161.97	37,602.85	13,685.68	23,917.17	6.9
1847	343,617.56	29,893.75	27,335.05	14,914.55	12,420.50	3.6
1848	343,617.56	30,807.12	27,810.52	16,397.00	11,413.52	3.3
1849	340,017.56	36,988.17	33,280.75	15,341.87	17,938.88	5.3
1850	342,017.56	35,795.48	32,571.73	16,583.30	15,988.43	4.7
1851	349,474.60	29,587.54	26,603.62	17,627.43	8,976.19	2.6
1852	349,474.60	39,761.40	35,268.04	17,938.93	17,329.11	5 ³¹

The changes in capital from year to year were the result principally of purchases and sales of land and slaves. Land to the value of \$8,789.58 was purchased, while \$2,057.56 was received from sales of land, during the twenty-six years. In the same period seven additional

³⁰ Hopeton Plantation Records.

³¹ *Ibid.*

slaves were bought and twenty sold. The land evidently had increased in fertility because the crops were larger and produced more income in the later years than in the earlier. The slave record for the plantation has not been located. But Sir Charles Lyell gave indirect evidence of an increase in the number of slaves when he wrote that in 1845 there were 500 at Hopeton, or an increase of 120 from the original 380.³²

Another plantation for which an extensive record has been preserved is Gowrie, owned by Louis Manigault and located on the Savannah River. The sole money crop was rice. The original value of the plantation was \$40,000, and on it were 220 acres of cleared ground, 80 acres uncleared, a fine rice mill, and 50 slaves. The plantation was gradually increased in size until finally it had 638 acres in cultivation, and from time to time additional slaves were purchased. The average value of the plantation during the first six years was approximately \$42,115. Net proceeds of the crops of these years were \$43,750, total expenses were \$12,000, which made the average profit \$5,095 a year or 12 per cent on the investment.³³

There is a gap of sixteen years in the records; then for six years there is a detailed account of all receipts and expenditures. Manigault's investment, through the purchase of additional land and slaves, had increased to approximately \$80,000 by 1857. The gross sales of rice for the six years from 1855 to 1861 were \$103,739.55. Selling costs for the same period were \$22,964.73, making net sales \$80,774.82. Plantation expenses totaled \$22,135.84, leaving as total net profits for six years, \$58,638.98, or an average annual profit of \$9,766.49. This amounted to a 12.2 per cent return upon the capital invested in the plantation.³⁴

The profits from Gowrie were much higher than those from Hopeton. This may be accounted for in part by the difference in the years which the records cover, but probably more because Manigault did not make his home on the plantation, and no household expenses are included in

³² Lyell, *Second Visit*, I, 261-62.

³³ Statement of Louis Manigault, no date, pasted on flyleaf of "Statement of Sales—Gowrie Plantation—Savannah River," in Manigault Plantation Records (Southern Collection, University of North Carolina).

³⁴ Manigault Plantation Records.

the statement of plantation expenditures. It is certain, however, that Manigault did not consider these last six years to be extraordinarily successful ones. On the contrary he believed them to be particularly difficult.

The plantation had suffered epidemics of cholera in 1852 and 1854 in which twenty slaves, including "many of our *very best* hands," had died. There had been a destructive freshet in 1852, and a hurricane on September 8, 1854, both of which not only injured the standing crops but also strewed the entire plantation with loose rice "to the vast injury" of succeeding crops. Manigault's experienced overseer died in December, 1855, and it was not until April 8, 1859, that another capable man was employed. The overseers in the interim neglected the plantation and the slaves, and it took a year for the new overseer to repair injuries done by his predecessors.

This was satisfactory to the owner, who, in writing his report of operations during 1859-1860, said:

Mr. Capers has not made a large crop but he says it was much on a/c of the bad condition in which he found the plantation, & I believe him, I am satisfied thus far with him, feeling that he has had no chance. We have bought two new Mules this winter, working in all six mules. During the past winter Mr. Capers has done much work. He has cut a new Canal through two squares, on the upper portion of the plantation, which I think will be of service. We have for the first time used the double horse ploughs, turning the lands much deeper than previously.

In spite of all these difficulties and neglect the land evidently had not deteriorated. The average production for the six years from 1833 to 1838 was 374 barrels of clean rice, while during the six years from 1855 to 1861 the crop averaged 843 barrels. There was, as said above, an increase in acreage devoted to rice from 220 to 638, or 190 per cent, but there was also an increase in production from a low of 220 barrels in 1833 to a high of 995 barrels in 1856, or 397 per cent.³⁵

The plantation lost thirty-eight slaves in three cholera epidemics in 1834, 1852, and 1854, which forced Manigault to purchase forty-six slaves, between 1833 and 1861, in addition to the original fifty. This

³⁵ *Ibid.*

makes a total of ninety-six slaves brought to or purchased for the plantation; but there still were ninety-seven slaves on the plantation in 1857, the last year in which there is a record of the number of slaves. Consequently, it is not correct to charge any of this additional investment in slaves to expense. All that happened was that the natural increase in number and value was wiped out by the epidemics and the plantation neither made nor lost money on its working force.³⁶

A third plantation for which there is record of capital, expense, and profits, is that of James H. Hammond of South Carolina, also on the Savannah River. Early in the 1850's Hammond offered his plantation, which he valued at \$163,750, for sale. The plantation according to this offer consisted of the following:

1. 150 Negroes who shall constitute 80 task or effective hands and only 2 to 3 non-effective	\$80,000.00
2. 6300 acres . . . excluding . . . the Silverton Residence & tract of 280 acres & on the other side the Marsh & 1000 or 1500 acres as it may be, but including about 3000 acres of cleared land in good order—650 of it drained land—all except about 100 acres well marled, with mills, landing, etc. @ \$12 per acre	75,600.00
3. 6000 bushels corn—60,000 pds. fodder.	3,500.00
4. 30 mules & horse under 12 years mostly under 9 years.	3,000.00
5. 5 fair Plantation Waggon. 3 ox carts. 4 Horse carts. 30 sets of gears. 60 ploughs, etc.	1,000.00
6. 100 head of hogs @ 1.50 & 40 head Cattle all $\frac{1}{2}$ to Ayreshire with full blood bull and 10 oxen @ 10.00	650.00
	<hr/>
	\$163,750.00 ³⁷

The detailed records of income and expenditure on Hammond's plantation do not appear to have been preserved but there is a memorandum in his papers which gives exact information for the five-year period from 1849 to 1853. During these years the total income from the sale of cotton, corn, rice, and fodder was \$81,088.83. Plantation expenses amounted to \$27,019.37, leaving a profit of \$54,069.46, or an average annual profit of \$10,813.89. Accepting his offer of sale as the total

³⁶ *Ibid.*

³⁷ Memorandum initialed J. H. H., no date, but probably 1852, in James H. Hammond MSS. (Division of Manuscripts, Library of Congress).

value of his investment, though its original cost to him probably was much less, Hammond had an average net annual return of 6.66 per cent.³⁸

Unlike most planters, Hammond kept a separate record of his family expenses apart from the plantation records. In the same five years these expenses amounted to \$31,913.55, which, if deducted from profits, gives him an annual net income over all expenses, business and personal, of \$4,431.18, or 2.7 per cent.³⁹

There seems to be no more justification for a depreciation charge against land or slaves on this plantation than there was at Gowrie or Hopeton, because, at least in Hammond's opinion, the plantation was gaining, not losing value. In 1859 he again wrote out an offer of sale, but this time he asked \$175,000 and included only 140 Negroes comprising 70 full hands, 5,500 acres of land, fewer horses, mules, cattle, and pigs, and less corn and fodder.⁴⁰

The records of these three plantations have been presented, not because they are considered to be typical of the plantation system, but merely because, through accident, they have been preserved in more detail than most others. Each was larger than the average plantation in the South, and all three were located in the older part of the South, where, incidentally, by common report, profits were lower than in the newer districts. They do indicate, however, that year after year, during periods of financial crisis or prosperity, some plantations were making profits in the ordinary business sense of the term, and were increasing, not decreasing in value.

The evidence from these plantations, together with the overwhelming evidence of increase in wealth found in the census reports and in Herbert Weaver's study of the individual returns in two counties of Mississippi, all seem to point in a single direction. And that is to the tentative conclusion that the students who have stated that slavery was profitable are more nearly correct than those who deny its profitability.

³⁸ Undated, unsigned memorandum in Hammond's writing, *ibid.*

³⁹ *Ibid.*

⁴⁰ Offer of Sale, July 19, 1859, *ibid.*

The Reunion of Two Virginia Counties

By SUSIE M. AMES

An unusual instance of provincial control, bearing a date of almost two hundred and seventy-five years ago, is found in the court records of Accomack and Northampton, the two counties making up the Eastern Shore of Virginia. The records show the government at James City taking extreme measures against a county whose chief magistrate had displayed an irresponsible attitude and was threatening the rights of a minority group and the interests of all classes. The settlement made by the provincial government, moreover, seems not unrelated to the events and developments culminating in Bacon's Rebellion. In addition to throwing some light on one of the phases of southern life "incompletely understood," the account contains a law of the Virginia Assembly in regard to county formation that is not included in William W. Hening's *Statutes at Large . . . of Virginia*.

The making of counties by division and even subdivision of large areas, in order to secure a more convenient judicial and administrative unit, is a familiar development; but the reversal of that process is unusual. On the Eastern Shore of Virginia in the year 1670 the county of Accomack was by act of the General Assembly reunited to the county of Northampton from which it had been formed in the previous decade; and it so remained for about three years. For convenience of administration the county was divided into the upper part and the lower part of Northampton. Apparently little publicity was given to the change

at that time, and later writers either ignored the development or received a false impression concerning it.¹

The statute providing for the reunion is as follows:

Att a Grand Assembly holden att James Citty the 3rd 8^{ber}
[October] 1670

Whereas the late disturbance in the Counties of Accomacke and Northampton can by noe better meanes bee composed or settled than by reduceinge the Said Two Counties into one Itt is ordered that both the Said Counties bee united and Soe remaine one County untill there Shall appeare good cause againe to devide them.

Test. Hen: Randolph Cl Assem:

Recorded the 8th of Nov^{br}: 1670 per

Mr. Dan: Neech

Dep: Cl. Cu. Co: North^{ton}²

The Eastern Shore had been explored by Captain John Smith in 1608 and settled in 1614; in 1634 it had become one of the eight original shires. At that time the county bore the Indian name "Accowmacke"; but in 1642 it was renamed "Northampton" through the influence of its leading citizen, Obedience Robins. In the year 1663, however, a few months after the death of Colonel Robins, Northampton was divided into two counties, the southern or lower part retaining the name Northampton and the upper retaking the earlier name, Accomack.³ The man chiefly responsible for the division was Colonel Edmund Scarburgh, a Royalist and the leader of the faction that had opposed Robins, a Parliamentary.⁴ Scarburgh, the largest landholder of the Eastern Shore, a

¹ In connection with the Burgesses listed for Accomack in September, 1663, Hening states: "This is the first appearance of the name [Accomack], among the *counties*, since the year 1642-3. In Mercer's Abridgement it is stated to have been formed in 1672. Perhaps it then resumed its original name." William W. Hening (ed.), *The Statutes at Large; Being a Collection of all the Laws of Virginia* [1619-1792], 13 vols. (Richmond, 1809-1823), II, 197 n. Even Bruce seems not to have realized the changed status of Accomack and its re-establishment in 1673. See Philip A. Bruce, *Institutional History of Virginia in the Seventeenth Century*, 2 vols. (New York, 1910), I, 500.

² Northampton County Order Book, X (1664-1674), fol. 91. There is no record of this act in Hening (ed.), *Statutes at Large*. The county records for Northampton are located in the courthouse at Eastville, Virginia. These are also the records for Accomack until 1663, the date of the division into two counties.

³ Susie M. Ames, *Studies of the Virginia Eastern Shore in the Seventeenth Century* (Richmond, 1940), 4-6.

⁴ As early as 1653 there had been agitation on the Eastern Shore in regard to the division of the county. Hening (ed.), *Statutes at Large*, I, 384.

burgess and the surveyor general of the colony, succeeded in impressing upon the Assembly the need of the formation of a county in the northern half of the peninsula. Thus, at a meeting of the court of Northampton County held March 23, 1662 (Old Style), the last before the division, several men took the oath of a justice of peace for Accomack County and Scarborough was sworn high sheriff.⁵ The first meeting of the court of Accomack was held on April 21, 1663, and among its transactions was the appointment of surveyors of the highway and of constables "according to an order" of the court of Northampton County of March 23, 1662 (O.S.).⁶

The Northampton court, which had co-operated in putting the new county upon a sound legal basis, now played a dominant role in the reduction of Accomack and the reunion of the two counties. On October 16, 1670, at the first meeting of the court for "the upper part of the county of North^{ton} formerly called Accomacke," the majority of the justices were members of the commission for the lower part of the county.⁷ The governor appointed justices for the upper part, but these must meet with one of the commissioners of the lower part.⁸ Colonel John Stringer, who had been the first of the quorum for Northampton when the division was made in 1663⁹ and still headed that commission in 1670, became the presiding officer of the reunited courts. By order of the Council and General Court, he also became high sheriff of both parts of the Eastern Shore, "both now reduced into one county."¹⁰

The clerk of Northampton County became the clerk of the reunited

⁵ Northampton County Order Book, VIII (1657-1664), 165.

⁶ Accomack County Deeds and Wills, I (1663-1666), 1. The records for Accomack County from the year 1663 are located in the clerk's office at Accomack, Virginia; there is also a photostat copy of the records for the years 1632-1640.

⁷ Accomack Orders, III (1666-1670), 197. For a list of justices for the lower part of Northampton present at the meeting of that court held November 9, 1670, see Northampton County Order Book, X (1664-1674), fol. 91.

⁸ Accomack Orders and Wills, IV (1671-1673), 150. Although the records within this volume are of the period when Accomack was "the upper part of Northampton," for the present the term "Accomack" seems a more convenient reference and it is one sanctioned by current and long-standing usage; likewise for the records of "the lower part of Northampton," merely the word "Northampton" is appropriate.

⁹ Northampton County Order Book, VIII (1657-1664), 166.

¹⁰ H. R. McIlwaine (ed.), *Minutes of the Council and General Court of Colonial Virginia, 1622-1632, 1670-1676*. . . (Richmond, 1924), 241.

counties and the custodian of the Accomack records; but the transfer of those records was made only after the court had given an order to that effect. When Colonel Stringer brought "word" from Secretary Thomas Ludwell at James City that Robert Hutchinson, "late clerke" of the county of Accomack, should deliver the records to the clerk of the court of the county of Northampton, the meticulous Hutchinson requested an order from the court empowering the clerk of Northampton County, William Mellinge, to give him a discharge for the delivery of the records.¹¹

In other respects, however, the customary procedure was followed in the two courts held each month in Northampton County, one for the upper and one for the lower part. Cases were tried, orders given, and routine business conducted. It was, for instance, ordered by the court that the inhabitants of the upper part of the county bring in their list of tithables and that the respective surveyors of the highways see them cleared. In August, 1671, it was ordered that the clerk set up a note at the court door to give the freeholders of the upper part of the county notice to meet their respective burgesses and present their grievances according to law.¹²

The explanation of the reunion of the two counties is found in the character and activities of Colonel Scarburgh who, ironically, had been the man most active in securing the division in 1663. The abuse of his authority as chief magistrate of Accomack County was the immediate cause of the reduction of that county. His unjust and cruel treatment of the Indians in Accomack County brought the swift condemnation of the Virginia government. An order, dated September 12, 1670, signed by William Berkeley and addressed to William Mellinge, high sheriff of Northampton County, was given for Scarburgh's arrest and his appearance before the Governor, Council, and Assembly on October 7. "I am informed by persons of known worth & Integrity and by Some of the Officers of both the Counties on the Eastern Shore," wrote Governor Berkeley, "That Coll Edmund Scarburgh hath contrary to my

¹¹ Accomack Orders, III (1666-1670), 197, 200. The record on p. 200 is the last regular record in this volume; the following pages are unrelated to this period.

¹² Accomack Orders and Wills, IV (1671-1673), 16, 192-95.

Order and the Peace long since established betweene us & the Indians unjustly & most Tiranously oppressed them by Murthering Whipping & burning them, By taking their children by force from them who are their parents & many other waies to the apparent hazard of the sd Peace established as aforesd." Twelve days later when the writ was executed on Scarburgh for having "Soe unjustly & contrary to Law & Order abused the Authority comitted to him," the prisoner offered as security four leading citizens of the county—Devorax Browne, Richard Hill, John Fawcett, and Robert Hutchinson—or if such "Bail" were not sufficient, to give within twenty-four hours forty able persons. But "My order is not to take bail" was the laconic answer of Charles Holden, the special bailiff appointed by the sheriff of Northampton County. Thereupon, a declaration was made by Scarburgh, attested by Browne, Hill, Hutchinson, Holden, and Owen Marsh and recorded by Hutchinson, who was clerk of court, to the effect that four days earlier he had been summoned by the Governor as a burgess for the county of Accomack and was at that instant bound over to James City on "public service."¹³

Although the maladministration of the chief official and the support accorded him by other local officers were directly responsible for the severance of their control over Accomack and its changed status, there were other significant causes which likewise had their origin in the character and activities of Scarburgh. Two boundary disputes of that period necessarily loom large, that between the Eastern Shore of Virginia and of Maryland and that between Accomack and Northampton. Each boundary had been determined a few years earlier but not altogether to the satisfaction of all concerned. Even the Colonel had not been satisfied with the line drawn in 1668 between northern Accomack and Maryland, although he, as surveyor general of Virginia, had

¹³ Accomack Deeds and Wills, II (1664-1671), 166-67. The records herein cited—the Governor's order, the execution of the writ, the offer of bail, and Colonel Scarburgh's declaration of departure to James City as burgess—are truly imbedded, as they are, with the addition of the record of the first meeting of the upper part of the reunited county, the only records of this character in this volume of Accomack Deeds and Wills. The Governor's order gives the historical basis for the tradition, current on the Eastern Shore, of Scarburgh's arbitrary punishment of some Indians by having them shot by a concealed cannon.

been one of the commissioners appointed by the Virginia governor to draw the line.¹⁴ Moreover, in the spring of 1670 the General Court indicated a belief that Scarburgh was planning to enlarge the northern boundary of Accomack, for the Court ordered Colonel Stringer of Northampton County "after his arrival at Accomack in the name and by the authority of this Court" to command Colonel Scarburgh "at his peril" not to alter the bounds until he received an order from the Court.¹⁵ The order attested the influence and activity of Stringer and also the Court's distrust of Scarburgh at that time, and it presaged a strict accounting if the occasion should warrant it.

It was, however, the boundary line between Northampton and Accomack that was most heavily charged with inflammable material. When the two counties were formed in 1663 there was an unequal allotment of territory, Accomack receiving even more than the proverbial lion's share. The division line, which at that time gave to the lower county only the area extending from Cape Charles to the region of Nassawadox Creek,¹⁶ was credited to the machinations of Scarburgh, the Accomack commissioner, who prevailed upon William Waters, the Northampton commissioner, to make the division upon the basis of population at that time, thereby giving to the upper and more remote section of the peninsula a larger territorial area. This inequality was deeply resented by the leaders of Northampton, and the rapid development of Accomack, together with the power of its leading official, added fuel to Northampton's burning dissatisfaction.

Political and territorial relations, important as they are to the understanding of the reasons for Accomack's reduction, need to be supplemented by a view of the economic situation if the background is to be complete. The depression of the 1660's¹⁷ affected Colonel Scarburgh

¹⁴ Ames, *Studies of the Virginia Eastern Shore*, 7-8.

¹⁵ McIlwaine (ed.), *Minutes of the Council and General Court*, 212.

¹⁶ Northampton County Order Book, VIII (1657-1664), fol. 167; Accomack Orders, III (1666-1670), 127; Northampton County Order Book, X (1664-1674), 257; Northampton County Order Book and Wills, XV (1683-1689), 461-62; Northampton County Deeds and Wills, XVI (1692-1707), 265-68. In Northampton County the most northern plantation on the Bay side was that of John Dalby. Additional references and material in regard to the boundary could be given.

¹⁷ Winder Transcripts, 2 vols. (Virginia State Library, Richmond), I, 191-94, 249-51;

most adversely; he with others socially and politically prominent joined the debtor class. During the latter part of that decade British creditors clamored for some financial return for plantation supplies furnished him to the extent of hundreds of pounds sterling; and their demands, growing ever more insistent, produced a situation from which evolved his plans and activities of the year 1670.

There is no doubt that his treatment of the Indians was motivated by economic considerations. At the time that creditors were falling upon him, Indian forays and thefts in the more northern part of Accomack were lessening the profits from his plantation there. It was then that the Colonel took the law into his own hands, hoping that well-directed cannon shot would end his grievance.

It is obvious also that his contemplated enlargement of Accomack County on its northern border had its origin in the economic strain of that era. An extension of the boundary to the north would serve a twofold purpose. The Indians, "straightened for want of land," could be pushed northward and Indian depredations thereby eliminated. It is significant that Scarburgh did not take extreme measures against the Indians until the General Court, by the order of April, 1670, had forbidden him to alter the northern boundary of Accomack. The second purpose served would result from the opportunity afforded for patenting additional acreage, which could be profitably disposed of by the patentee. That Scarburgh was not averse to land speculation is seen from some sales made by him a few years earlier,¹⁸ and as surveyor general of Virginia, as planter and merchant, he had demonstrated his ability to provide a liberal acreage for himself.

In short, the financial embarrassment of that period spurred that keen, but undisciplined and impulsive, individualist to illegal lengths. The abuse of his authority gave a legal basis for curtailing the power he had used in so buccaneering a fashion. His critics and the officials of law and order combined to place him beyond the pale. Furthermore,

DeJarnette Transcripts, 2 vols. folio (Virginia State Library), I, 284-85, 296-99, 300; Sainsbury Transcripts, 20 vols. (Virginia State Library), XV, 104; McDonald Transcripts, 7 vols. (Virginia State Library), VI, 169; Hening (ed.), *Statutes at Large*, II, 32, 119, 190-91, 200-201, 209-210, 221-22, 224-26, 228-29, 251-52.

¹⁸ Ames, *Studies of the Virginia Eastern Shore*, 28.

since the court of Accomack County seemed to reflect at that time the lengthened shadow of Colonel Edmund Scarborough, Accomack County must be foreshortened, must be reduced to an innocuous status. Therefore, on October 3, 1670, Accomack became the upper part of Northampton County.

Various records throw light upon the functions of the judicial machinery of the reunited counties. Some idea of the legal situation immediately following the reunion may be secured from the Edward Hamond case. At the first meeting of "the court of the upper part of Northampton" there was an appeal made by Hamond from the judgment of the late court of Accomack in the year 1667. That court, however, refused to prosecute against Hamond in the newly-created court. It requested, "for the vindication of the legality of their own order," an appeal to the General Court at James City, and the case was accordingly transferred.¹⁹

Administrative difficulties occasionally clogged the machinery. A petition of "the inhabitants of the upper part of Northampton county, formerly Accomack county," presented to the Governor in the autumn of 1672, shows that the arrangement made in regard to commissioners was not satisfactory. They wrote that the justices, "by the indisposition of body of some of them as also the badness of weather together with the distance of place," were often prevented from coming, and the people were forced to wait several days, "to their great charge and trouble," before their business could be transacted. They requested that two of the commissioners of the upper part might be of the quorum, and that if one of these were present, a court might be held in the absence of the gentleman of the lower part of the county, and, also, that all business within their bounds might be tried there "as formerly when we were a distinct county." In reply to the petition the Governor wrote, "This is granted as far as I can grant it." Captain Southy Littleton and Captain John West were appointed "of the quorum."²⁰

Two changes within less than a decade in county formation beyond

¹⁹ Accomack Orders, III (1666-1670), fol. 37, p. 198.

²⁰ Accomack Orders and Wills, IV (1671-1673), 150.

the Chesapeake led to some inaccuracy in nomenclature even on the part of those who had brought about the changes. Occasionally the Council and General Court forgot and issued a patent for land or referred a difference appealed to that body to Accomack County, or they even located and fined an absentee grand juryman in a county legally nonexistent.²¹

With difficulties and inconveniences arising from the reunion, it was an a priori conclusion that when the condition necessitating the arrangement was changed, there would again be a separation. With the death of the "unjust judge" in the spring of 1671, the way was prepared for the restoration of Accomack County; no longer was there the fear that the once all-powerful Scarburgh, the "Conjuror,"²² would stage a comeback to power as he had at one time so brilliantly done.

The movement for the restoration, gathering momentum in 1672, culminated November 7, 1673, in the appointment of the "Accomack County Commission."²³ In December the Governor assented to a request signed by five of the justices and by the clerk of the court that Charles Scarburgh, the son of Colonel Edmund Scarburgh, might be joined to the commission as the second of the quorum "as he was formerly."²⁴

From a legal standpoint especial interest centers around the administering of the oaths to the justices. That there had been discussion as to the procedure to be adopted is seen from the following letter:

Deare Cozen

I have received yours of the 16th of Decemb^r by M^r Littleton & can finde no better Expedient for the Swearinge of the Commissioners for Accomack County then that Coll Stringer who is Judge of Northampton County shall doe it, and I desire you in my Name to Speake to him to doe it when the next Court is called—

Yo^r affectionate Cozen
and Servant

William Berkeley

²¹ McIlwaine (ed.), *Minutes of the Council and General Court*, 264, 275, 320, 379.

²² This was the title the Indians gave Scarburgh.

²³ Accomack Wills, V (1673-1676), 17-18. The justices were Captain Southy Littleton, Captain John West, Captain Edmund Bowman, and Hugh Yeo of the quorum, and John Wise, Captain Daniel Jenifer, William Custis, Thomas Ryding, and Thomas Browne.

²⁴ *Ibid.*, 19.

A postscript was added that if Colonel Stringer were sick, the first in commission should go to him and be sworn and then give the usual oaths to the others.²⁵ Apparently Stringer was not sick, for on January 6, 1673 (O.S.), at the first court held for the recreated county of Accomack, he administered the oaths of allegiance and supremacy and that of a justice of the peace to Captain Southy Littleton and Charles Scarburgh, who then administered the oaths to the rest of the commission then present.²⁶

Thus the reunion was brought officially to an end. It is necessary, however, to speak of some results and the significance in general, inasmuch as this development in county formation, though of brief duration, had some far-reaching effects.

Locally, the most noticeable consequence of that period was the refocusing of attention upon the boundary between the two counties. After having exercised her authority over the entire area for about three years, Northampton resented more deeply than ever after 1673 her reallocation of that very small part of the peninsula that had been her portion before 1670. A few years later the controversy gained a sharper edge and forced a redivision of territory. The ghost of Colonel Scarburgh arose again and again to plague the inhabitants of the smaller county who declared that he had outwitted Colonel Waters, Northampton's boundary commissioner, "to our great detriment and Loss" and to the "great advantage" of Colonel Scarburgh;²⁷ finally the General Assembly took action in regard to the grievance. No record is to be found in Hening, but there is a reference in a court meeting held for Northampton County, November 26, 1677, to the "order of the last Assembly for enlargement of the county of Northampton to the evenest extent of Hungars parish."²⁸

There followed, however, a complaint by Accomack of Northamp-

²⁵ *Ibid.* No addressee was given for the letter, but the "Cozen" was probably John West, a son-in-law of Scarburgh.

²⁶ *Ibid.*

²⁷ Winder Transcripts, II, 169-73. See also, "Causes of Discontent in Virginia, 1676. Northampton Grievances," in *Virginia Magazine of History and Biography* (Richmond, 1893-), II (1894-1895), 289-92.

²⁸ Northampton County Order Book, Wills, XII (1674-1679), 203.

ton's encroachment upon "the limits set by the last Assembly,"²⁹ and another dispute centering upon the bounds of Hungars Parish developed.³⁰ Thereupon the Assembly of February, 1677, ordered that the lower county should be enlarged to the south side of Occahannock Creek if "due proof" could be given of an agreement between Scarburgh and Waters that whenever Accomack County should enlarge above Onancock, Northampton should enlarge proportionately upon Accomack.³¹ About a decade later, however, the boundary case was pending in the General Court, which had become in 1682 the highest judicial authority in the colony; Accomack was defending "the complaint brought by Northampton County."³² The following year a surveyor, Edwin Conway, sent "from the other side of the Bay for division of the differences,"³³ secured on March 22, 1687, the agreements of Lieutenant Colonel John West and Captain John Custis, the agents of Accomack and Northampton, to a line running between Matchapungo and Occahannock creeks, "a final determination and decision of the long debate and difference."³⁴ So the present boundary, contrary to the opinion generally held, was not that drawn in 1663; and, furthermore, the drawing of that line in 1677-1687 was closely related to the situation on the Eastern Shore within the years 1670-1673.

Another result of the reunion, though negative in character, should not pass unnoticed. The swift and summary punishment meted out to Scarburgh probably forestalled an Indian uprising in the northern part of Accomack. There seems little doubt that the relations between the Indians and the colonists under the hotheaded leadership of Scar-

²⁹ Accomack Orders, VII (1676-1678), 84.

³⁰ Northampton County Order Book and Wills, XII (1674-1679), 221, 228.

³¹ Winder Transcripts, II, 118-19.

³² Accomack Wills and Orders, IX (1682-1697), 111.

³³ Northampton County Order Book and Wills, XV (1683-1689), 336.

³⁴ Accomack Wills and Deeds, VI (1676-1690), 484-85. There are given, of course, various marks of identification for the line, chiefly plantations. That line may have ended the debate temporarily but about a generation later agitation was resumed by Northampton. There is a brief item in the *Journals of the House of Burgesses* for 1730 to the effect that the proposition from Northampton County for adding to it part of Accomack County was rejected. H. R. McIlwaine (ed.), *Journal of the House of Burgesses of Virginia* [1619-1776], 13 vols. (Richmond, 1905-1915), VI, 65.

burgh would have culminated in a war comparable to that about a decade earlier on the Eastern Shore.³⁵ Furthermore, an Indian uprising in 1670 would probably have resulted a few years later in that section's active participation in the Rebellion on the side of Nathaniel Bacon, Jr., and as a consequence the Governor would not have found a refuge there at a crucial period of the conflict. Indeed, the Governor's success in securing peaceful relations between the Eastern Shore Indians and the colonists doubtless made the latter—irrespective of the realism of their greeting upon his arrival³⁶—more inclined to give him their support.

The fact that through the intervention of the provincial government peace was maintained between the two races in 1670 may not be unrelated, moreover, to Berkeley's attitude toward the Indian uprisings which led to Bacon's Rebellion. The situation on the Eastern Shore in 1670 bore a striking resemblance to that on the Western Shore a few years later; in each instance Indian depredations brought an independent and warlike protest from a prominent colonist. Berkeley's arrest of Scarborough for fighting the Indians and the speedy measures taken by the provincial government to prevent any effective leadership by him had secured peace on the Eastern Shore. It seems probable that Berkeley's success in curbing Colonel Scarborough, thereby keeping the Indians quiet on the peninsula east of the Chesapeake, was a reason for his attempting a similar policy with reference to Bacon.³⁷ Certainly in the light of the outcome of official intervention on the Eastern Shore, it is easier to understand the Governor's arrest of Bacon and his failure to appraise correctly the Indian situation on the Western Shore. Had Berkeley acted promptly in 1675, he might indeed have remained master of the situation. He waited, however, until the movement had

³⁵ Ames, *Studies of the Virginia Eastern Shore*, 6.

³⁶ *Ibid.*, 9.

³⁷ This point has been suggested by Professor Chitwood. See also, his statement that the Governor pursued a waiting policy with the hope that the horrors of an Indian war could be averted. Oliver P. Chitwood, *A History of Colonial America* (New York, 1931), 93. Professor Wertenbaker speaks of Berkeley hoping to prevent further depredations and fearing that an invasion of Indian lands might defeat that purpose. Thomas J. Wertenbaker, *Virginia under the Stuarts, 1607-1688* (Princeton, 1914), 15.

seized upon other grievances, and had gathered sufficient momentum temporarily to overwhelm constitutional authority. On the Eastern Shore, however, the provincial government had maintained control and this proved to be more important than the Indian and local issues involved in the reunion of the two counties.

Notes and Documents

THE JOURNAL OF WILLIAM MOULTRIE WHILE A COMMISSIONER ON THE NORTH AND SOUTH CAROLINA BOUNDARY SURVEY, 1772

EDITED BY CHARLES S. DAVIS

Although Alexander S. Salley's monograph, *The Boundary Line between North Carolina and South Carolina*, sheds considerable light on the long-standing boundary dispute between the two states, it is only recently that a firsthand account of the survey of 1772 has become available. William Moultrie, one of the South Carolina commissioners, kept a daily account of the progress of the surveying party, and this journal was recently discovered among the William Moultrie Papers.

As an Indian fighter in the Cherokee War and as a defender of Sullivan's Island during the Revolution, Moultrie's activities are well known, but his interest in land speculation in western North Carolina is revealed by the contents of this journal.¹ Aided by William Dry, one of the North Carolina commissioners, Moultrie apparently succeeded in acquiring valuable tracts of land through which the surveying party passed.

In May, 1772, commissioners appointed by the governors of the two provinces were instructed to run the line west of the Catawba River. This survey was an outgrowth of two previously unsuccessful attempts to arrive at a satisfactory common boundary.² In 1735 the line was to

¹ For a biographical sketch of Moultrie, see Robert L. Meriwether, "William Moultrie," in *Dictionary of American Biography*, 20 vols. and index (New York, 1928-1937), XIII, 293; and Edward McCrady, *The History of South Carolina under the Royal Government* (New York, 1901), 335, 557.

² See William L. Saunders *et al.* (eds.), *The Colonial [and State] Records of North Carolina*, 30 vols. (Raleigh, etc., 1866-1914), IX, 299-300; David D. Wallace, *The His-*

begin at a point thirty miles south of the Cape Fear, run northwest until it struck the thirty-fifth parallel, and then continue due west.³ In 1764 the boundary was projected westward until it intersected the Charleston-Salisbury road near Waxhaw Creek, but the surveyors made an error of eleven miles in locating the thirty-fifth parallel.⁴ It was in compensation for this error that South Carolina was given land north of the thirty-fifth parallel on the west side of the Catawba River. The completion of the survey was undertaken in 1772 by running a line west from the Catawba River to Tryon Mountain, but offset in such a manner as to leave the Catawba Indians in South Carolina. The people of North Carolina were unwilling to concede to South Carolina thousands of acres of land which at some future time would be suitable for settlement, and insisted that the thirty-fifth degree of north latitude which had been agreed upon in 1735 should not be changed.⁵

King George III, however, decreed that the line should follow the boundaries of the reservation allotted to the Catawba Indians, thence up the Catawba River to its forks, and from there due west to Tryon Mountain. When Governor William Tryon asked the Assembly for funds to finance the survey, his request was refused, and the King was petitioned not to insist upon the line. Contrary to the wishes of the people of North Carolina, the Governor authorized that the line be run, and notwithstanding public remonstrances it was never altered.⁶

In addition to the daily account of the boundary survey, the student of southern history may also be interested in Moultrie's description of the roads and topography of the King's Mountain area. A few brief observations about Charlotte in 1772 are likewise of significance.

History of South Carolina, 4 vols. (New York, 1934), III, 34; Alexander S. Salley, *The Boundary Line Between North Carolina and South Carolina*, in *Bulletin of the Historical Commission of South Carolina*, No. 10 (Columbia, 1929), 9 ff.

³ Salley, *Boundary Line Between North and South Carolina*, 9-10.

⁴ Robert L. Meriwether, *The Expansion of South Carolina, 1729-1765* (Kingsport, Tenn., 1941), 247-50.

⁵ Saunders *et al.* (eds.), *Colonial [and State] Records of North Carolina*, IX, xix; John P. Arthur, *Western North Carolina, A History* (Raleigh, 1914), 25.

⁶ Samuel A'Court Ashe, *History of North Carolina*, 2 vols. (Greensboro, 1925), I, 398-99; Arthur, *Western North Carolina*, 24-25.

JOURNAL ON THE SURVEY OF THE BOUNDARY—1772

May 16, 1772

Left my plantation⁷ to join Col [William] Thomson (at his own house), one of the Commissioners.⁸ Took my two servants Tobias and Dick with me and one baggage horse with 2 — 5 gal kegs, one wine and one rum, and 2 blankets and a bear skin for my bedding [*sic*] — no tent — lay at Mr. Tacitus Guillard⁹ on the Santee River about 35 miles.¹⁰

17

Set out early and dined at Col Thomson's on Congaree River, about 20 miles, and then proceeded with Col Thomson to Mr [John] Corde's ferry where we stayed all night.¹¹

18

Proceeded and dined at Mr Collons 26 miles on Sterling hill (about 14 miles from Camden), arrived at Camden and stayed at Mr [Joseph] Kershaw's; our horses with servants were sent to the publick house of Rogers'. Here we were joined by Jas Cook,¹² one of the surveyors, and appointed Ephraim Mitchell¹³ the other (D[r]. [Benjamin] Farrer was appointed by the Governor [of South Carolina] but not attending) ; we appointed Mitchell in his room.

⁷ Moultrie's plantation known as "Northampton" was in St. John's Parish, Berkeley County. It has now been inundated by a lake forming the Santee-Cooper power project.

⁸ Colonel Thomson was a resident of Amelia Township, South Carolina, and at one time was engaged in trading with the Cherokee. Later he served in the Cherokee War and in the "Snow Campaign" of 1775 against the Loyalists. He was under Moultrie at Sullivan's Island; after the Revolution he became a member of the state Senate. Anne K. Gregorie, "William Thomson," in *Dictionary of American Biography*, XVIII, 489.

⁹ Gaillard was a member of the colonial Assembly, a colonel of militia, and a justice of the peace. He was also elected to the provincial Congress in 1775 but declined to serve. See Public Records of South Carolina (Transcripts from the British Public Records Office, in South Carolina Historical Commission, Columbia), III, 589; also, Peter Force (ed.), *American Archives*, Fourth Series, 6 vols. (Washington, 1839), V, 570; *ibid.*, Fifth Series, 3 vols. (Washington, 1848), III, 63.

¹⁰ Throughout the journal punctuation has been slightly changed where it was necessary for clarity.

¹¹ McCorde's Ferry was on the Congaree River just above the mouth of Wateree Creek. It is clearly indicated on Henry Mouzon's map, but it is incorrectly labeled "McCant's Ferry."

¹² James Cook was one of the surveyors appointed in 1767 to make a map of South Carolina, and it is presumed that he was the one who discovered the mistake in the location of the thirty-fifth parallel in the survey of 1764. See Meriwether, *Expansion of South Carolina*, 250.

¹³ Mitchell was associated with Mouzon in making a map of South Carolina in 1775. See Journal of the Commons House of Assembly of South Carolina (MS. in South Carolina Historical Commission), XXXIX, 274-76 (April 26, 1775).

19

All our party now joined we proceeded on 7 miles to Sutton's where we dined; then went on 15 miles further and encamped in the woods about 1 mile from Hanging Rock. Nothing remarkable here but a midling [*sic*] large rock hanging over a small creek.¹⁴

20

This being the day appointed for the meeting of the North Carolina Commissioners at the corner tree¹⁵ on the Salisbury road where the former Commissioners [of a previous survey] had stopped, we moved off early and proceeded about 15 miles, then stoped [*sic*] to dine on a creek called [writer's blank] near Cap Bartleys, running into Lynch's creek.¹⁶ Here about is the thickest part of the Waxsaw Settlements;¹⁷ pretty good lands; a great many large wheat fields; very few negroes among them; all their work is done by plowing and English husbandry. After dinner proceeded 8 miles and joined the North Carolina Commissioners and surveyors, viz: Col John Rutherford,¹⁸ Col Will^m Dry,¹⁹ Comm[issioner]^s and Col Tho^s Rutherford²⁰ and Cap Tho^s Polk,²¹ surveyors; and chain carriers and blazors. They had tents and a wagon to carry their baggage; after the usual compliments and a glass or two of wine we proceeded immediately to business, by each party showing his commission and instructions to the other.

21

We agreed that a surveyor from each Province should attend the Compass every day and that the Chain should be carried alternately, and two blazors from each side to follow the Surveyors. The Commissioners, one from each Province, to be always with the Compass and Chaine [*sic*] and to see the Blazors do their duty. We waited at the old corner tree till 12 o'clock to take an observation. Sun's Altitude 75 — 35 latitude 34.48. After dinner we proceeded and encamped at a Run about 4½ miles, we took the different courses along the Salisbury road, which made it very tedious. At our setting out we had a

¹⁴ Afterwards the site of a British post which was attacked by Thomas Sumter in the summer of 1780.

¹⁵ A tree marking a surveyor's corner.

¹⁶ The creek referred to was probably Lane's Creek.

¹⁷ Community of Scotch-Irish in Lancaster County which grew up around "Old Waxhau Church." McCrady, *History of South Carolina under the Royal Government*, 315-17.

¹⁸ Rutherford was Receiver General of His Majesty's Revenues for North Carolina and a resident of Burke County. Saunders *et al.* (eds.), *Colonial [and State] Records of North Carolina*, XXVI, 329.

¹⁹ Dry was a resident of Brunswick County, North Carolina, a member of the colonial Assembly, customs collector, colonel of the militia, and justice of the peace. See *ibid.* IV, 447; IX, 298.

²⁰ Clerk and registrar of Cumberland County, North Carolina. *Ibid.*, IX, 298.

²¹ Resident of Mecklenberg County. *Ibid.*, XXVI, 742.

number of people to see us set off, I believe near a hundred men women and children.

22

Run $2\frac{1}{2}$ miles and came to 12 mile Creek, one of the Catawba boundaries, then run parallel 2 mile with the Creek and came to a Corner tree. From here we began to blaze over the old blazes that were made for the Catawba Line;²² we proceeded 7 miles further and encamped at six mile creek, very good land; run $11\frac{1}{2}$ miles this day.

23

Run this day 8 miles and crossed sugar creek. We at times saw some very good land, the people very thickly settled close to the Indian Line,²³ some of their houses almost upon it. They have an advantage that they have a fine range for their cattle, which in all probability will continue many years until the Catawba's are extinct or bought out. The Catawba Lands are a very fine body, it's a square of $14\frac{1}{2}$ miles, they occupy but a very small part, their Town is built up in a very closs [*sic*] manner and the field that they plant does not exceed 100 acres—we encamped at the Catawba Corner near Mr [William] Cray's.

24

Sunday halted from business; some of us took a ride to Charlotte Town in Meclinburgh [Mecklenburg] County. The Town has a tolerable Court house of wood about 80 by 40 feet, and a Goal [*sic*], a store, a Tavern, and several other houses say 5 or 6, but very ordinary built of logs. From here we went to Cap [Thomas] Polks about a mile, spent the day agreeable [*sic*] and returned to Camp about 12 miles off.

25

Run from Indian Corner over to Catawba River 7 miles and 26 chains; about a mile from the River the lands very hilly and some pretty good; from thence run parallel with the River 5 miles without blazing. Some fine lands, settlements very thick along the River; encamped about 2 miles [from] the North and South branch of Catawba River.

26

Run 2 miles along the River and came to the North and South branch of Catawba River, waited to take an observation, Latitude $35^{\circ} - 8'$, from here we were to begin our western course. We took all our Compasses, set them together,

²² The "Catawba Line" was a line established by a previous survey offset in order to leave the Catawba Indians in South Carolina. See Arthur, *Western North Carolina*, 25.

²³ The "Indian Line" refers to the Catawba Line.

and fixed up one to carry the Line through with; one Commissioner from each Province attended closely to the Compass. We proceeded on our west course 4 miles and 50 chain and encamped; the land here hilly and not extraordinary.

27

Run 10 miles and 30 chain and encamped at 15 mile tree about 2 miles from Kings mount, the Line passed between Kings mount and a very high one to the Southward of it. There are not very high mountains but tolerable high hills; near this place a waggon road passes through to Charles Town about 180 miles. The land hereabout not extraordinary, rather too near the mountain. NB: it is called Kings mountain from the name of a person who first settled about this place.

28

Passed through the spur of the mountains four miles, but ordinary land, then began to come unto good lands; here we began to take up lands. Col Thomson began at the 19 mile tree and run two thousand acres on the line; myself run two thousand acres adjoining [*sic*] the above. I think very good, 2 – 500 tract on the line and 2 – 500 acres of the back of the above, fine oak and hickory; run 8 miles today 2 or 3 miles but ordinary, encamped at or near the 22 mile tree; near this place a waggon road goes to Charleston 180 miles to Town.

29

Run ten miles to day and Xed [crossed] Broad river 31½ miles from Catawba river; run 2 – 500 acre tracts today beginning at the 28 mile tree, run along the Line 140 chain in which we crossed Buffalo creek. The above tracts on Green's on the north side of the Line; crossed over Broad river about 2 miles below the fork; swam our horses over and carried our baggage and selves over in an Indian canoe; encamped about ½ mile beyond the river at 31 mile tree. Here the North Carolinians were obliged to leave their waggon and take to pack horses, as we had done at first, their waggon had retarded us several times before.

30

Run 12 miles this day and encamped at 44 mile tree; 8 miles of this runing [*sic*] is some of the worst land I ever saw, most scrub oak and pine, at the 40 mile tree the land began to be very good. I began to [take] up lands from 40 to 41 mile tree and several other tracts adjoining on the North side of the Line which Col Dry is to have entered for me in the North Province. We run almost parallel with the Broad River all this day, sometimes not [but] about a half mile from it.

31

Encamped about 11½ mile from Broad river on horse picture creek, called

so from the picture of a horse drawn on a tree by an Indian; some very good lands, here took up 500 acres for Mr Lynch.

1 June

Run the Line 12 miles this day and encamped at 56 mile tree near John Woods. This day runing [*sic*] went mostly through good lands; I mark from 50 to 54 mile trees and several other tracts which Col Dry is to have entered for me.

2 June

Run 9 miles this morning and struck the Cherokee Line about 6 or 7 miles below Tryon mountain and made a red oak Corner on the Cherokee Line;²⁴ here we had a very good view of the mountain. Tryon mounting [*sic*] appears to be a very high one; we dined at the Corner tree, and returned back 5 miles where we encamped between old Moore's and his son's house on North Paulet about 1/2 mile to the Southward of the Boundary line. Here we waited till the 4 June in the evening when the surveyors had four plans finished, two for each Province, and signed by all the Commissioners and surveyors; the Plans for the South Province were signed by their Commissioners and surveyors names first. We signed in the following manner—

Certified by us the 4 June 1772²⁵

W ^m Moultrie	}	Commissioners for South Carolina ²⁶
W ^m Thomson		
John Rutherford	}	Commissioners for North Carolina ²⁷
W ^m Dry		
Ja ^s Cook	}	Surveyors for South Carolina
Ep Mitchell		
Tho ^s Rutherford	}	Surveyors for North Carolina
Tho ^s Polk		

²⁴ The "Cherokee Line" was run in 1766 and 1767. No grants were permitted west of the Line since it marked the beginning of the land of the Cherokee Indians. See Salley, *Boundary Line Between North Carolina and South Carolina*, 21-22.

²⁵ Governor Joseph Martin to the Earl of Hillsborough, Secretary, June 5, 1772, in Saunders *et al.* (eds.), *Colonial [and State] Records of North Carolina*, IX, 299-300.

²⁶ The South Carolina Commissioners had been promised £10 a day for their work, but the Commons House thought this amount not enough and agreed to pay them a flat sum of £1,700. Journal of the Commons House of the Assembly, XXXIX, 134, 141 (March 17, 18, 1772).

²⁷ The North Carolina Commissioners received £266 each for seventy-six days' service as boundary commissioners. Saunders *et al.* (eds.), *Colonial [and State] Records of North Carolina*, IX, 302.

A CIVIL WAR SECRET SERVICE CODE

EDITED BY JOHN G. WESTOVER¹

During the Civil War secret codes were used by both armies, but neither made an attempt at standardization, leaving their preparation to various military organizations in the field. As a rule the codes were similar to those then used by the armies of Prussia, France, or England. The example reproduced here was of a common type and was designed and used by General Merriwether Jeff Thompson of the Confederate Army.²

M. Jeff Thompson, soldier, civil engineer, inventor, poet, was born January 22, 1826, at Harpers Ferry, Virginia.³ He traveled west in the mid-1840's and settled at St. Joseph, Missouri, where he was successively a store clerk, farmer, surveyor, engineer, and, in 1859, mayor of the city. At the outbreak of the Civil War he was elected brigadier general of the First Division of the Missouri State Guards, which gained considerable recognition under the descriptive name of the "Swamp Fox Brigade." Thompson participated in the battles of Lexington, Carthage, and Booneville before being captured in 1863. He was exchanged the following year, and early in 1865 was appointed to the command of the Northern Sub-District of Arkansas. In his farewell address following his surrender on June 5, 1865, he expressed the hope to his men that they would be better citizens than they had been soldiers. After the war he was appointed chief engineer of the Board of Public Works of Louisiana, a position that he held until his death, September 5, 1876.⁴

¹ About nine-thirty on the morning of December 7, 1941, Lieutenant John G. Westover, U.S.A., called at my home to discuss the general research problems involved in the writing of his doctoral dissertation on the Confederate Secret Service. He had brought the M. Jeff Thompson Collection of manuscripts with him and in looking through it I noticed the code. I urged him to publish the document and promised to have it photostated for him. He began work on the project, but three days later he was ordered from Camp Claiborne and is now with the United States Army somewhere on the European front. It is with the permission of his faculty adviser, Professor Lewis E. Atherton, of the Department of History, University of Missouri, that this document is published. [Edwin Adams Davis, Department of Archives, Louisiana State University.]

² The M. Jeff Thompson Collection is owned by Miss Eleanor P. Thompson of New Orleans, who has given permission to publish the code. The document is handwritten on a 9 by 10¼ inch sheet of heavy paper. It was apparently Thompson's personal copy.

³ Lieutenant Westover edited the "Civil War Experiences of General M. Jeff Thompson" for his master's degree thesis at the University of Missouri.

⁴ For the career of Thompson, see *Appleton's Cyclopaedia of American Biography*, 7 vols. (New York, 1894-1900), VI, 94; Louise Platte Hauck, *Missouri's Yesterday* (Kansas City, 1920), 167; Chris L. Rutt (comp.), *History of Buchanan County and St. Joseph, Missouri* (St. Joseph, 1915), 281; *History of Buchanan County, Missouri* (St. Joseph, 1881), 912; Mrs. Marcie A. Bailey, "Civil War Experiences of General M. Jeff Thompson," (MS. in the Missouri State Historical Society, Jefferson City); Luther T. Crocker, "Studies in the Early History of St. Joseph, Missouri" (M. A. thesis, University of Colorado, 1934).

O	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L	M	N	O	P	Q	R	S	T	U	V	W	X	Y	Z
A	A ₀	A ₁	A ₂	A ₃	A ₄	A ₅	A ₆	A ₇	A ₈	A ₉	A ₁₀	A ₁₁	A ₁₂	A ₁₃	A ₁₄	A ₁₅	A ₁₆	A ₁₇	A ₁₈	A ₁₉	A ₂₀	A ₂₁	A ₂₂	A ₂₃	A ₂₄	A ₂₅
B	B ₀	B ₁	B ₂	B ₃	B ₄	B ₅	B ₆	B ₇	B ₈	B ₉	B ₁₀	B ₁₁	B ₁₂	B ₁₃	B ₁₄	B ₁₅	B ₁₆	B ₁₇	B ₁₈	B ₁₉	B ₂₀	B ₂₁	B ₂₂	B ₂₃	B ₂₄	B ₂₅
C	C ₀	C ₁	C ₂	C ₃	C ₄	C ₅	C ₆	C ₇	C ₈	C ₉	C ₁₀	C ₁₁	C ₁₂	C ₁₃	C ₁₄	C ₁₅	C ₁₆	C ₁₇	C ₁₈	C ₁₉	C ₂₀	C ₂₁	C ₂₂	C ₂₃	C ₂₄	C ₂₅
D	D ₀	D ₁	D ₂	D ₃	D ₄	D ₅	D ₆	D ₇	D ₈	D ₉	D ₁₀	D ₁₁	D ₁₂	D ₁₃	D ₁₄	D ₁₅	D ₁₆	D ₁₇	D ₁₈	D ₁₉	D ₂₀	D ₂₁	D ₂₂	D ₂₃	D ₂₄	D ₂₅
E	E ₀	E ₁	E ₂	E ₃	E ₄	E ₅	E ₆	E ₇	E ₈	E ₉	E ₁₀	E ₁₁	E ₁₂	E ₁₃	E ₁₄	E ₁₅	E ₁₆	E ₁₇	E ₁₈	E ₁₉	E ₂₀	E ₂₁	E ₂₂	E ₂₃	E ₂₄	E ₂₅
F	F ₀	F ₁	F ₂	F ₃	F ₄	F ₅	F ₆	F ₇	F ₈	F ₉	F ₁₀	F ₁₁	F ₁₂	F ₁₃	F ₁₄	F ₁₅	F ₁₆	F ₁₇	F ₁₈	F ₁₉	F ₂₀	F ₂₁	F ₂₂	F ₂₃	F ₂₄	F ₂₅
G	G ₀	G ₁	G ₂	G ₃	G ₄	G ₅	G ₆	G ₇	G ₈	G ₉	G ₁₀	G ₁₁	G ₁₂	G ₁₃	G ₁₄	G ₁₅	G ₁₆	G ₁₇	G ₁₈	G ₁₉	G ₂₀	G ₂₁	G ₂₂	G ₂₃	G ₂₄	G ₂₅
H	H ₀	H ₁	H ₂	H ₃	H ₄	H ₅	H ₆	H ₇	H ₈	H ₉	H ₁₀	H ₁₁	H ₁₂	H ₁₃	H ₁₄	H ₁₅	H ₁₆	H ₁₇	H ₁₈	H ₁₉	H ₂₀	H ₂₁	H ₂₂	H ₂₃	H ₂₄	H ₂₅
I	I ₀	I ₁	I ₂	I ₃	I ₄	I ₅	I ₆	I ₇	I ₈	I ₉	I ₁₀	I ₁₁	I ₁₂	I ₁₃	I ₁₄	I ₁₅	I ₁₆	I ₁₇	I ₁₈	I ₁₉	I ₂₀	I ₂₁	I ₂₂	I ₂₃	I ₂₄	I ₂₅
J	J ₀	J ₁	J ₂	J ₃	J ₄	J ₅	J ₆	J ₇	J ₈	J ₉	J ₁₀	J ₁₁	J ₁₂	J ₁₃	J ₁₄	J ₁₅	J ₁₆	J ₁₇	J ₁₈	J ₁₉	J ₂₀	J ₂₁	J ₂₂	J ₂₃	J ₂₄	J ₂₅
K	K ₀	K ₁	K ₂	K ₃	K ₄	K ₅	K ₆	K ₇	K ₈	K ₉	K ₁₀	K ₁₁	K ₁₂	K ₁₃	K ₁₄	K ₁₅	K ₁₆	K ₁₇	K ₁₈	K ₁₉	K ₂₀	K ₂₁	K ₂₂	K ₂₃	K ₂₄	K ₂₅
L	L ₀	L ₁	L ₂	L ₃	L ₄	L ₅	L ₆	L ₇	L ₈	L ₉	L ₁₀	L ₁₁	L ₁₂	L ₁₃	L ₁₄	L ₁₅	L ₁₆	L ₁₇	L ₁₈	L ₁₉	L ₂₀	L ₂₁	L ₂₂	L ₂₃	L ₂₄	L ₂₅
M	M ₀	M ₁	M ₂	M ₃	M ₄	M ₅	M ₆	M ₇	M ₈	M ₉	M ₁₀	M ₁₁	M ₁₂	M ₁₃	M ₁₄	M ₁₅	M ₁₆	M ₁₇	M ₁₈	M ₁₉	M ₂₀	M ₂₁	M ₂₂	M ₂₃	M ₂₄	M ₂₅
N	N ₀	N ₁	N ₂	N ₃	N ₄	N ₅	N ₆	N ₇	N ₈	N ₉	N ₁₀	N ₁₁	N ₁₂	N ₁₃	N ₁₄	N ₁₅	N ₁₆	N ₁₇	N ₁₈	N ₁₉	N ₂₀	N ₂₁	N ₂₂	N ₂₃	N ₂₄	N ₂₅
O	O ₀	O ₁	O ₂	O ₃	O ₄	O ₅	O ₆	O ₇	O ₈	O ₉	O ₁₀	O ₁₁	O ₁₂	O ₁₃	O ₁₄	O ₁₅	O ₁₆	O ₁₇	O ₁₈	O ₁₉	O ₂₀	O ₂₁	O ₂₂	O ₂₃	O ₂₄	O ₂₅
P	P ₀	P ₁	P ₂	P ₃	P ₄	P ₅	P ₆	P ₇	P ₈	P ₉	P ₁₀	P ₁₁	P ₁₂	P ₁₃	P ₁₄	P ₁₅	P ₁₆	P ₁₇	P ₁₈	P ₁₉	P ₂₀	P ₂₁	P ₂₂	P ₂₃	P ₂₄	P ₂₅
Q	Q ₀	Q ₁	Q ₂	Q ₃	Q ₄	Q ₅	Q ₆	Q ₇	Q ₈	Q ₉	Q ₁₀	Q ₁₁	Q ₁₂	Q ₁₃	Q ₁₄	Q ₁₅	Q ₁₆	Q ₁₇	Q ₁₈	Q ₁₉	Q ₂₀	Q ₂₁	Q ₂₂	Q ₂₃	Q ₂₄	Q ₂₅
R	R ₀	R ₁	R ₂	R ₃	R ₄	R ₅	R ₆	R ₇	R ₈	R ₉	R ₁₀	R ₁₁	R ₁₂	R ₁₃	R ₁₄	R ₁₅	R ₁₆	R ₁₇	R ₁₈	R ₁₉	R ₂₀	R ₂₁	R ₂₂	R ₂₃	R ₂₄	R ₂₅
S	S ₀	S ₁	S ₂	S ₃	S ₄	S ₅	S ₆	S ₇	S ₈	S ₉	S ₁₀	S ₁₁	S ₁₂	S ₁₃	S ₁₄	S ₁₅	S ₁₆	S ₁₇	S ₁₈	S ₁₉	S ₂₀	S ₂₁	S ₂₂	S ₂₃	S ₂₄	S ₂₅
T	T ₀	T ₁	T ₂	T ₃	T ₄	T ₅	T ₆	T ₇	T ₈	T ₉	T ₁₀	T ₁₁	T ₁₂	T ₁₃	T ₁₄	T ₁₅	T ₁₆	T ₁₇	T ₁₈	T ₁₉	T ₂₀	T ₂₁	T ₂₂	T ₂₃	T ₂₄	T ₂₅
U	U ₀	U ₁	U ₂	U ₃	U ₄	U ₅	U ₆	U ₇	U ₈	U ₉	U ₁₀	U ₁₁	U ₁₂	U ₁₃	U ₁₄	U ₁₅	U ₁₆	U ₁₇	U ₁₈	U ₁₉	U ₂₀	U ₂₁	U ₂₂	U ₂₃	U ₂₄	U ₂₅
V	V ₀	V ₁	V ₂	V ₃	V ₄	V ₅	V ₆	V ₇	V ₈	V ₉	V ₁₀	V ₁₁	V ₁₂	V ₁₃	V ₁₄	V ₁₅	V ₁₆	V ₁₇	V ₁₈	V ₁₉	V ₂₀	V ₂₁	V ₂₂	V ₂₃	V ₂₄	V ₂₅
W	W ₀	W ₁	W ₂	W ₃	W ₄	W ₅	W ₆	W ₇	W ₈	W ₉	W ₁₀	W ₁₁	W ₁₂	W ₁₃	W ₁₄	W ₁₅	W ₁₆	W ₁₇	W ₁₈	W ₁₉	W ₂₀	W ₂₁	W ₂₂	W ₂₃	W ₂₄	W ₂₅
X	X ₀	X ₁	X ₂	X ₃	X ₄	X ₅	X ₆	X ₇	X ₈	X ₉	X ₁₀	X ₁₁	X ₁₂	X ₁₃	X ₁₄	X ₁₅	X ₁₆	X ₁₇	X ₁₈	X ₁₉	X ₂₀	X ₂₁	X ₂₂	X ₂₃	X ₂₄	X ₂₅
Y	Y ₀	Y ₁	Y ₂	Y ₃	Y ₄	Y ₅	Y ₆	Y ₇	Y ₈	Y ₉	Y ₁₀	Y ₁₁	Y ₁₂	Y ₁₃	Y ₁₄	Y ₁₅	Y ₁₆	Y ₁₇	Y ₁₈	Y ₁₉	Y ₂₀	Y ₂₁	Y ₂₂	Y ₂₃	Y ₂₄	Y ₂₅
Z	Z ₀	Z ₁	Z ₂	Z ₃	Z ₄	Z ₅	Z ₆	Z ₇	Z ₈	Z ₉	Z ₁₀	Z ₁₁	Z ₁₂	Z ₁₃	Z ₁₄	Z ₁₅	Z ₁₆	Z ₁₇	Z ₁₈	Z ₁₉	Z ₂₀	Z ₂₁	Z ₂₂	Z ₂₃	Z ₂₄	Z ₂₅

DIRECTIONS FOR USING CIPHER

Key: Liberty or death [The key was changed frequently].

Directions: Write the key continuously under the sentence to be put in cipher. Commence with the first letter of the key which will be found at the top of the alphabet. Follow down the left side of that column until the letter of the sentence directly over the key letter is found; the juxta letter in the same column will be the cipher letter.

Example:

Sentence	S	e	n	d		m	o	r	e		a	m	m	u	n	i	t	i	o	n	
Key	L	i	b	e		r	t	y	o		r	d	e	a	t	h	L	i	b	e	
Cipher	D	m	o	h		d	h	p	s		r	p	q	u	g	p	e	q	h	r	

To translate the cipher:

Cipher	D	m	o	h		d	h	p	s		r	p	q	u	g	p	e	q	h	r	
Key	L	i	b	e		r	t	y	o		r	d	e	a	t	h	L	i	b	e	
Sentence	S	e	n	d		m	o	r	e		a	m	m	u	n	i	t	i	o	n	

Book Reviews

The Old South. The Founding of American Civilization. By Thomas Jefferson Wertenbaker. (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1942. Pp. xvi, 364. Illustrations. \$3.50.)

The Old South is social history written after a fashion that has been all too rare. Nearly fifty years ago Edward Eggleston wrote *The Transit of Civilization from England to America in the Seventeenth Century*, but since that time many historians have written as though there had never been a transit in civilization: it seems to have been spontaneously generated by the American environment, mainly by the frontier. But Professor Wertenbaker pushes his starting point back to earlier circumstances and begins with the knowledge, customs, and arts that were brought from the Old World to the southern seaboard by the settlers; only then does he consider the successive changes wrought by environment and intercultural conflicts upon the basic importations. For example, in discussing the early Virginia house, he begins with its ancestral prototypes in several parts of England and in Flanders and Holland; he enumerates changes made in it under the influence of local conditions in Tidewater Virginia—"the high cost of labor, the absence of stone, the cheapness of wood, the climate, difficulties of transportation, etc."—and the newer foreign trends; and he follows architectural developments in housebuilding as civilization moves westward. Occasionally but not often environmental factors are slighted: soil differences between the Shenandoah Valley and the Virginia piedmont must have had something to do with agricultural divergencies in these two areas. But towering above the minor points over which there may be quibbling is the fact that Professor Wertenbaker has written about cultural history as a changing, developing process, a thing which is much harder to do than to describe the scene at a given moment; and he has given balance and depth to his narrative by taking into account the heritage of the settlers as well as the physical environment to which they came.

The main theme is the operation of the cultural melting pot into which diverse European stocks were put and from which new cultural fusions emerged. For instance, the conclusion is reached that neither "the Germans, nor the Scotch-Irish, nor the slaveholding planters, but . . . the melting-pot" won the triangular battle of civilizations that occurred in the Blue Ridge region. "The

Germans relinquished their language, their folk art, their architecture; they retained their religious beliefs and not only kept their agricultural economy, but lent it to their neighbors. The Scotch-Irish, although they gradually gave up their dialect, their industry and to a large extent their agriculture, retained their loyalty to the Presbyterian Church. . . . The Tuckahoes forced on their neighbors their language, their political system, their common law and to a limited extent slave labor."

As the author states frankly in his preface, one must look elsewhere for extended treatments of education, church history, slavery, the plantation system, and political history and institutions. He has focused his attention upon the artisans, merchants, yeomen, land tenure, and, above all else, architecture; and he has charted the course of cultural change in the South Atlantic region with data drawn chiefly from these more or less neglected fields.

Duke University

CHARLES S. SYDNOR

Proceedings and Debates of the British Parliaments respecting North America. Volume IV, 1728-1739; Volume V, 1739-1754. Edited by Leo Francis Stock. (Washington: Carnegie Institution, 1937, 1941. Pp. xxviii, 888; xxvi, 658. \$3.50, paper; \$4.00, cloth.)

Sixteen years ago, Dr. Leo Stock published through the Carnegie Foundation the first volume of the *Proceedings and Debates of the British Parliaments respecting North America*. Since that time four other volumes have been published, bringing the material down to 1754, and the value of the work and our debt to Dr. Stock grow with each completed volume. Tedious work it is and slow, work that requires all of Dr. Stock's large supply of patience and scholarship.

Volume IV covers the period from 1728 to the outbreak of the war with Spain in 1739. It is a wearisome volume but a necessary one. Four hundred and seventy-seven of the 858 pages consist of debates on Spanish misdeeds. Speech after speech, page after page in endless repetition damn the Spaniards and the government. Yet the editor was right in omitting none of it.

The rest of Volume IV is concerned with petitions, committee reports, and debates on colonial trade, industry, currency, debts, and government. Sugar and tobacco take up a great deal of space, and Georgia is debated, for and against, on many a day.

Volume V covers a period of the war with Spain and France and the interlude of peace down to 1754. Now that the country actually was at war, there was less talk and more action in Parliament. Debates on commercial restrictions again consume much of Parliament's time. Again the petition and committee reports contain interesting material on tobacco, indigo, currency, and problems connected with the iron trade. On these and other matters the activities of colo-

nial agents can be discerned in their petitions and memorials, and all the clashing interests at home and in the colonies are fought out here.

Both volumes contain the rather scanty items in the legislative record of the Irish Parliament that relate to America. Of particular interest in Volume IV is the material dealing with the taking of white servants into the American colonies, and with the practices carried on by ship captains. Also in Volume V there are lists of minor offenses. The Irish records also contain discussions of bills laying duties on American goods.

So valuable have these records been to colonial historians that all of us earnestly hope that nothing will unduly delay the publication of the volumes covering the French and Indian War and the American Revolution.

Vanderbilt University

PHILIP DAVIDSON

Ante-Bellum South Carolina. A Social and Cultural History. By Rosser H. Taylor. (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1942. Pp. xii, 201. \$2.50.)

This book is all that is claimed for it on the jacket flaps. Many widely scattered sources, both primary and secondary, were searched out and combed for elusive but significant bits of testimony, direct and indirect evidence to be woven together into a tapestry depicting a way of life with a quite clearly defined pattern. Having worked with many of the same materials for the political, constitutional, and economic history of the same region and period, the reviewer many years ago saw that a fascinating social and cultural history could be written. This volume meets expectations fully.

The task undertaken by Professor Taylor was a worthy but very difficult one because sources to the point are so widely scattered, fragmentary, elusive, and at times illusive. In the main the documentation of his major points is convincing, but on some points the reader feels that a section of the tapestry pattern had, of necessity, to be woven with but few scraps of yarn.

After an introduction devoted to social and sectional origins, the author plunges into accounts of the four pillars of the social order—ancestors, possessions, occupations, and education. As is appropriate and necessary, he presents the distinctions of, and differences between, low country and upcountry in all important phases of the social order.

Houses and homes, furniture, transportation, the yeoman farmer, the planting gentry, the relations of masters and slaves on farms and plantations, small towns and city, planters, the professions, farmers, tradesmen, merchants, artisans, mechanics, poor whites, aristocrats, the *code duello*, benevolences, patriotism, military training, horse racing, public dinners, tournaments, gander pullings, cockfighting, hunting, dancing, women's sphere, marriage customs and marriage settlements, dress, crimes, sex relationships (whites, blacks, and interracial), amusements, the overseer, charities, health and diseases, diet, ideals and prac-

tices in education, the theater, concerts, art, newspapers and periodicals, lectures, the church and its auxiliaries, Negro crimes and punishments, and the safeguarding of the social organism—all these subjects and more are presented and discussed, some in a completely convincing and satisfying manner, others in a way that the reader feels is as satisfactory as is possible with the sources available.

Although major features of the general picture as presented in previous accounts are not materially changed in this portrayal, here one finds sharpness and wealth of detail for many phases of cultural history which receive only a sentence or a suggestive phrase in works of fiction or even in historical works devoted primarily to other phases of life. The volume is well written from the standpoint of organization and literary style and is without passion, prejudice, or propaganda. The University of North Carolina Press is to be congratulated upon this excellent addition to its series of valuable contributions to ante-bellum history, not to mention its many contributions in other significant fields.

University of Nebraska

C. S. BOUCHER

Jefferson. By Saul K. Padover. (New York: Harcourt, Brace and Company, 1942. Pp. viii, 459. Illustrations, bibliography. \$4.00.)

Dr. Padover, assistant to Secretary of the Interior Mr. Harold Ickes, is a skillful biographer. He has selected his topics with discretion, has stressed the personal rather than the political life of his subject, and has presented him as a thoroughly human and even lovable character. An earnest belief in his own principles seems to have dominated Jefferson's public career, and if he had a wart it is hardly visible in this picture. Something approaching a blemish, however, is pointed out: Jefferson consistently employed others to do the more realistic political business while he stood apart with an air of philosophical aloofness. The general reader will find this a charming portrayal; the scholar will doubtless feel that the excellent presentation does not altogether atone for faults of construction.

Dr. Padover's system of annotation is as original as it is inconvenient. Although he gives fairly numerous citations, he almost consistently fails to identify his quotations. The book, however, is a serious study, and, on the whole, it is accurate in fact and reasonable in interpretation. Yet the author has consulted only the well-known materials and has not delved deeply into the various collections of Jefferson manuscripts. A really broad acquaintance with his subject would have obviated errors which, in themselves, are not of great importance. For instance, Bruton Parish Church is not supposed to be the oldest Episcopal edifice in the country; the colony of North Carolina did not declare its independence in March, 1776; David Ramsay, though born in Pennsylvania, was a South Carolina, not a Pennsylvania historian; John Taylor was "of Caroline," not of North Carolina; spinning machines do not weave cloth; the University

of Virginia's Rotunda is not modeled on the Parthenon; and Dr. Woodfin's name is Maude.

University of Virginia

THOMAS P. ABERNETHY

Poe's Richmond. By Agnes M. Bondurant. (Richmond: Garrett & Massie, Inc., 1942. Pp. x, 264. Illustrations. \$3.00.)

It should be said at once that although this book attempts to emphasize the importance of Poe's connection with Richmond, Virginia, it presents no information strictly related to Poe which is not available in better form elsewhere. The volume does succeed moderately well in fulfilling a secondary aim, that is, in bringing together for easy reference a mass of miscellaneous information about Richmond during the years 1811-1849.

The scope of the book is broad. There are preliminary chapters on Richmond as seen through the eyes of Poe's contemporaries, whether visitors or citizens, and on Poe's own life in Richmond. Then come sections on business, politics, education, libraries, religion, and amusements (listed in the table of contents as "The Church, the Theatre and Other Amusements"), and periodicals. As one would expect, the treatment of each of these topics is superficial; the writer does not attempt a detailed, firsthand investigation of any one of them. On the other hand, one may say in favor of the book that the writer goes (in so far as this reviewer is able to tell) to the best published authorities, when authorities exist, for her information.

In organization and style the volume is undistinguished but not incompetent. Although the author does not say that this book is an expanded master's essay, it smacks decidedly of the genus thesis.

Tulane University

GUY A. CARDWELL, JR.

The Tennessee Yeoman, 1840-1860. By Blanche Henry Clark. (Nashville: Vanderbilt University Press, 1942. Pp. xxiv, 200. Maps, bibliography, appendices. \$2.00.)

Realizing that the research and writing involved in a social and economic history of the common people of the Old South was beyond the power of a single individual, Professor Frank L. Owsley invited interested scholars to participate in the endeavor. This book, the first to be published, offers a new approach to the study of southern agricultural society, and the material it presents will necessitate an alteration in the stereotyped picture of the social and economic structure of the ante-bellum South.

There were millions of nonslaveholding farmers in the South. In fact, this group made up more than three fourths of the white population, including "poor whites," squatters, tenants, small landowners, and middle-class farmers of substantial means. The record of their lives and possessions may be found in

town and county archives and in the manuscript returns of the Federal Census, a type of source which has not hitherto been exploited to any marked extent. In *The Tennessee Yeomen* Miss Clark has developed a method and technique for the handling of these sources (see Introduction, pp. xvii-xxii) which command the attention of any scholar who expects to make use of similar material.

The status of the nonslaveholding farmer, his landholdings, and production are analyzed in their relation to the major sections of the state in which soil, topography, and marketing facilities determined the nature and degree of agricultural development. Of the whole farming class, a little over 65 per cent were nonslaveholders. In 1850, 45 to 50 per cent of this group owned no land, but by 1860 the proportion of the landless had decreased so that the majority had become yeomen, owning from one to one hundred acres of land each. Manual labor was not considered degrading and by hard work a farmer could improve his economic condition and his social position at the same time. Nowhere in the state were slaveholders and nonslaveholders widely separated but the two groups lived side by side in quite neighborly fashion. Moreover, the evidence does not show that the former group prevented the latter from acquiring good land.

The largest and most important element of society was the agricultural population, representing a variety of classes, types of production, and interests. This entire group was anxious to improve its economic and social status, a desire that found expression in print, on the platform, and in the activities of the natural leaders of the farming element. A movement got under way that produced an agricultural awakening. Not only were there exhortations to develop a pride in farming, but a definite program was also outlined for economic and social betterment. Improved and diversified farming, agricultural societies and periodicals, and manual labor colleges were urged by agrarian leaders. Of great importance was the agricultural fair which served to unify class and community. The creation of a State Agricultural Bureau in 1854 was a crowning achievement of the movement. The yeomen felt this and were not excluded from a direct participation in it. Opportunities for improvement were open to them and their freedom of choice was not curtailed.

A scholarly study of the interrelationship of land tenure, agriculture, and social classes gives scant opportunity for an author to display literary skill. In hands less capable than Miss Clark's this book might easily have become a nightmare to a reader. Great credit is due the author for the masterly way in which the material has been handled, for her presentation of the subject in clear, forceful sentences. An examination of the tables and appendices should furnish some idea of the tremendous amount of research that went into this work. If Philip Guedalla is right in saying that "History repeats itself; historians repeat each other," let us hope that historians, even textbook writers, will repeat the conclusions of this book.

The Coming of the Civil War. By Avery Craven. (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1942. Pp. xiv, 491. \$3.75.)

The material in this book revolves around three major points. First, Professor Craven deals with forces and factors out of which evolved the South as a conscious section. He shows that the ante-bellum South has been shrouded in romance and hidden by abolition propaganda. He emphasizes the fact that the South was not a land of indolent, licentious, wealthy planters, millions of Negro slaves, and large masses of poor whites only, but that by far the greater portion of the white people were middle-class yeoman stock; and that the South was a land of many diverse interests. Three great forces molded these people into a southern pattern and produced a southern nationalism. These forces were "a rural way of life capped by an English gentleman ideal, a climate in part more mellow than other sections enjoyed, and the presence of the Negro race in quantity." Professor Craven emphasizes also the economic depression and the work of such agricultural reformers as John Taylor and Edmund Ruffin. The institution of southern Negro slavery as depicted is indeed a mild one. The analysis of the South is concluded by a discussion of the emergence of the Cotton Kingdom.

The second portion of the book deals with the northern attack on the institution of slavery and the southern defense of it. Professor Craven maintains that the attack was based on a distorted picture of slavery that existed only in the imagination of northern reformers. He recognizes, however, that the abolition crusade was but one phase of the great humanitarian reform movement of the 1830's. He believes also that the attack was in large part responsible for the shift from an apologetic attitude on the part of the South to an out-and-out defense of slavery.

The third and major portion of the book is devoted to the political and sectional contest over slavery in the territories. Professor Craven believes that the Polk platform of 1844 and the so-called broken bargain contain the germ of the Republican party and hence the split of the Democratic party, the last of the great nationalizing institutions. He places the major responsibility for pressing the issue of slavery in politics on Calhoun, whereas he looks upon the North as the aggressor in the first phase of the conflict over slavery.

The ground covered by this book is of necessity familiar, but Professor Craven has brought to light much new data. This is not just another book dealing with the sectional conflict over slavery and the causes of the Civil War, however. It is, in fact, a new approach to and a new interpretation of that conflict. While Professor Craven does not overlook the social, economic, and political differences between the North and the South, has indeed examined more sources on these matters than any other writer on the subject, he places special emphasis on psychological or emotional factors. And he finds that actual differences between the sections did not necessarily mean an irrepressible conflict. The tragedy of

war "must, in large part, be charged to a generation of well-meaning Americans, who, busy with the task of getting ahead, permitted their short-sighted politicians, their over-zealous editors, and their pious reformers to emotionalize real and potential differences and to conjure up distorted impressions of those who dwelt in other parts of the nation." These molders of opinion created fictions, imagined tyrannies, and finally set both sides fighting against "mythical devils." This is a new and interesting thesis and Professor Craven develops it most ably and forcefully. But it is not altogether satisfying. Why did these leaders resort to such propaganda and why did the people accept it? The answers are not clear.

Professor Craven's general position as regards the sectional conflict is a balanced one. He hews to the line and lets the chips fall where they may. He places responsibility on Calhoun, Rhett, Yancey, and Gregg just as quickly as on Garrison, Seward, and Sumner. And he can see the sincerity of Douglas as well as of southern and eastern leaders. Many, however, will probably charge Professor Craven with being prosouthern in his interpretations.

This book, like Craven's earlier productions, is characterized by a style vivid, forceful, and brilliant. The book deserves and will win popularity among the general reading public as well as the special student and scholar. A few typographical errors escaped the proofreaders, and there are some errors in the use of names. J. H. Jacks should be T. H. Jack and R. R. Russell should be Russel. Greenhow not Greenbow was the author of a *History of Oregon and California*.

University of North Carolina

FLETCHER M. GREEN

Champ Ferguson, Confederate Guerilla. By Thurman Sensing. (Nashville: Vanderbilt University Press, 1942. Pp. xii, 256. Frontispiece. \$2.50.)

Champ Ferguson, notorious Confederate guerrilla from the Cumberland Mountains, was formally tried shortly after Appomattox by a military court in Nashville for the murder of fifty-three people. According to the testimony at the trial he must have killed many more in that amazing border warfare where few of the amenities of legalized homicide were practiced. There seems to have been no question of the accused man's brutality, his cunning, his courage, and his ruthlessness, and it has been amply proven that "nothing was more certain in those days than the vengeance of Champ Ferguson." He probably never did go so far as to "cut men's heads off and roll them down the hill like punkins," but some of his exploits do remind us of modern gangster murders. On the other hand, he was a perpetual thorn in the side of the Federals in Tennessee and on occasion his abilities as a scout and cavalryman with Morgan and Wheeler were extremely helpful to the southern cause.

Folklore has it that Champ was driven by more than hatred of the "G- d d- d Lincolmites," that he had sworn vengeance on eleven men who had invaded his house in his absence and forced his wife and daughter to undress, cook them a meal, and then walk unclad down the road. Mr. Sensing returns again and

again to this thesis as a reason for much of the killing, but, fortunately, considering the evidence at hand, never wholly commits himself. The major question at issue in the trial was whether Ferguson had been a regularly commissioned Confederate officer and therefore not personally responsible for his killings. In spite of the testimony of General Wheeler, the court decided against him and he was hanged forthwith.

The complete lack of footnotes, bibliography, and index suggests that Mr. Sensing's "life" of Champ Ferguson is designed for popular consumption, and yet the fact that nearly half of the text consists of quotations from newspaper reports of the trial seems to belie this. In fact, *Champ Ferguson* is a carefully reasoned series of deductions made from these patently biased newspaper accounts. It is simply impossible with the material at hand to do more. The references from the *Official Records*, at times so clumsily introduced, are of only minor importance to the main story. To mention a few of the author's many facile assumptions of fact which appear doubtful to the reviewer: the capture of Donelson by Grant was "probably the most momentous and decisive battle of the entire war," a fight between Champ and his brother Jim "naturally made a Rebel of the one and a Yankee of the other," the "political division between the North and South was the Kentucky-Tennessee line," and the account of the trial of Ferguson becomes a "history of guerilla warfare in the Upper Cumberland." It is doubtful if historians will agree that the book is based upon "an astonishing and unexpected amount of materials." Indeed, so much of the story of Champ Ferguson still remains in the realm of folklore that Mr. Sensing might have done better to have used the medium of the historical novel rather than that of biography.

University of Mississippi

JAMES W. SILVER

Howard University, The Capstone of Negro Education. A History: 1867-1940.

By Walter Dyson. (Washington: The Graduate School, Howard University, 1941. Pp. xiv, 554. Illustrations, bibliography. \$4.00.)

This book is intended as a summary of the development of one of the most important Negro universities. As such it has no doubt been of great interest to the alumni, faculty, and students of Howard University, especially since it includes a mass of encyclopedic detail. Every faculty member and administrative officer of the University since its founding is listed, and the names of hundreds of graduates are given. It also contains an analysis of the changes in curriculum during the period and a statement of the financial policy and condition of the University since 1867.

All this detail is of little value to the historian or to the general reader. But scattered through the book are many interesting and important facts, some of which have not hitherto been readily accessible. In many respects these nuggets

make this an unusual book. For example, one would hardly expect to find in a book written by a man who has been professor of history at Howard since 1905 such a caustic treatment of the so-called "Howard Investigation." Professor Dyson's analysis of the Freedmen's Bureau Ring is remarkable in its frankness and clarity. He shows that O. O. Howard and some ten or twelve associates, all influential members of the American Missionary Association, controlled the Freedmen's Bureau, the Freedmen's Saving and Trust Company, the First Congregational Church of Washington, and the Y. M. C. A. of Washington. These same men organized a "building block" company, which supplied the bricks used in the construction of many buildings erected by the organizations controlled by the group. Of this interlocking directorate Professor Dyson says frankly, "The possibility of collusion on the part of these men was strengthened by the evidence" (p. 21). The mixture of nepotism, collusion, and shrewd exploitation presented by Dyson makes a pretty picture, one which has probably not been surpassed in the history of the national capital.

Professor Dyson makes the significant suggestion that Howard, J. W. Alvord, and their associates planned to "develop in the District of Columbia a community similar in many respects to a New England town." To this end they established a church, a school, a cemetery, a tavern, and a series of industrial establishments, in which they employed university students at very low wages, in the hope that to the owners of the enterprises "would accrue unusually high dividends." In fact, says the author, "the whole scheme was a type of benevolent exploitation of student labor and university resources" (p. 110).

Since its establishment in 1867, Howard University has received from the Federal government \$16,974,039. Annual appropriations began in 1879 with a grant of \$10,000. The 1939 appropriation was \$834,200. From time to time opposition to this annual grant has arisen in Congress but the precedent has held, despite a decided change in the character of the institution. Those who supported the initial appropriation were true egalitarians, recognizing no color or racial lines whatever. George F. Hoar, for example, in 1870 asserted that Howard was the only school in the country in which there was absolutely no racial or sexual discrimination. Whites, Negroes, Indians, Mongolians, Nordics, and Latins sat side by side in the classroom. As a matter of fact, the school opened with a white student body and faculty, but in 1940 the student body was 99.1 per cent black and the faculty 91 per cent black.

Perhaps the scope of such a work necessitates a certain awkwardness in arrangement. Certainly no orderly pattern has been followed in this case. The author's style leaves much to be desired, and there are many typographical errors and other instances of inadequate editing. There is an excellent bibliography, although the author evidently did not examine the valuable papers of the Freedmen's Bureau, in which he would have found much pertinent material. There is an appendix containing several documents on O. O. Howard, and an index.

Vanderbilt University

H. L. SWINT

Mr. Dooley's America. A Life of Finley Peter Dunne. By Elmer Ellis. (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1941. Pp. xvi, 310, vii. Illustrations. \$3.00.)

In every decade the elders speak regretfully of yesterday's advantages which are denied the present-day youth. Such was the theme of one of the many conversations held several years ago between the reviewer and his colleague and former teacher. This colleague joined in the lament over the younger generation's loss in being deprived of the pleasure and entertainment of yesterday's era made famous by the contributions of its artists—Forbes-Robertson, Otis Skinner, Maude Adams, Kreisler, Paderewski, Melba, Galli-Curci, Schumann-Heink, Sousa, Victor Herbert, Ziegfeld, and numerous others among whom might well be listed James Whitcomb Riley, George Ade, and the inimitable Will Rogers. "The youth of today," he remarked, "are not the only losers, for your generation just missed the exhilarating experience of enjoying firsthand the writings of Will Rogers' prototype, Finley Peter Dunne and his Mr. Dooley." Although somewhat familiar with Dunne's pungent wit, the reviewer, like those of every younger generation, did not really appreciate the colleague's praise until he had read *Mr. Dooley's America*.

In this interesting biography, Professor Ellis traces the life of Finley Peter Dunne with proper emphasis on his more productive years. Dunne was born in Chicago in 1867, and prior to becoming a reporter at the age of seventeen, he had worked in a newspaper office. Promotion came fairly early and after having worked for practically all of the newspapers of Chicago, he was made managing editor of the *Chicago Journal* at the age of thirty. Subsequently, he was editor of the *New York Morning Telegraph* and later the editor of *Collier's Weekly*. Dunne, however, disliked the exacting responsibilities of an editor and after each experience gladly returned to the job of preparing his syndicated articles. He was gregarious and counted among his numerous friends the leading American authors and artists, cabinet officers, presidents, and European literary figures whom he met on his trip abroad.

Dunne was a keen political observer and reformer, but he did not subscribe to the tactics employed by the muckrakers. Except in a few instances, such as when he vigorously denounced the insurance combine, he attempted to correct existing evils by ridicule. In the early 1890's he created the literary character of Martin Dooley for this purpose. Mr. Dooley's ability to reach the core of a situation, to direct public attention to existing evils, to point out the perennial weakness of the American people, and inferentially to suggest a solution of the problem in humorous Irish dialect that was readily understood by the man of the street made him instantly popular. Dunne crystallized a segment of public opinion, for many individuals came to wait for Mr. Dooley with his sharp, succinct Irish wit to give expression to their inarticulate thoughts.

This is a timely biography, for Dunne was overshadowed by the fictitious character he created. While the general public knew Mr. Dooley intimately, it

was unfamiliar with his creator and the other contributions of this outstanding journalist. This biography is particularly significant to the historian since it recounts many important political events of United States history from the 1890 decade until the death of Dunne in 1936. The numerous quotations from Mr. Dooley make it all the more interesting and give the reader an impulse to reread all of his essays. To anyone interested in the political history of the period, this study is recommended without reserve.

Louisiana State University

WILLIAM B. HATCHER

Millhands & Preachers. A Study of Gastonia. By Liston Pope. (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1942. Pp. xviii, 369. Map, tables, bibliography. \$4.00.)

In April, 1929, the town of Gastonia, hitherto little known outside the Carolina textile region, made headline news because of the Loray strike. It was not the first strike in this area, but it was unique in the South in being led by Communists who by their agitation flaunted the traditions and mores of most of the population, and thereby incited violence which seriously retarded subsequent labor activity in Gastonia. The episode was widely commented upon in the periodicals of the day, both liberal and conservative; it became the theme of several novels; and it has been investigated from various angles by economists and sociologists. Professor Pope is the first scholar, however, to produce a comprehensive historical sociological study of the city's culture and social structure in the light of which events of 1929 can be better understood and more properly evaluated.

Cotton mills and churches have always been closely associated in the South. As the title of the book suggests, the author emphasizes the interplay of religious with economic and social forces. The rise of the mills in the 1870's and 1880's was favored by the churches. They provided moral supervision and enjoyed a growth in membership proportionate to that of the mills in the movement of rural population to the towns. The mill management in turn gave financial support to the churches, thereby strengthening the tradition of paternalism so firmly entrenched in the new industrial South. Wide differences in occupational status accompanying economic changes accentuated social classes and class churches—the comfort and security of the uptown churches in contrast to the perpetual state of insecurity of the mill village congregations. In a very lucid discussion of the evolution of churches and sects the author shows how the well-established denominations (Presbyterians, Lutherans, Methodists, and Baptists) had become ultraconservative uptown. In the mill villages, although most of the workers had been rural Methodists and Baptists originally, these churches lost ground to new sects like the Holiness group and the Church of God with their primitive emotionalism and highly personalized religion. As the economic and social system of the mill management became dominant in

the community, the older churches fell increasingly under its control. Thus, these ministers found themselves the beneficiaries of paternalism or its victims if they were inclined toward liberal ideas. Most of them, as well as the ecclesiastical bodies to which they belonged, were conservative on or indifferent to critical issues like child labor, mill village feudalism, and organized labor.

Somewhat less than two thirds of the book is devoted to a penetrating analysis of this background for the Loray strike of 1929. Although this upheaval has often been attributed exclusively to the influence of outside agitators, the author shows conclusively that internal conditions—lowered wages, the ruthless policy of a new superintendent in applying the “stretch-out,” resentment against paternalistic control—were more significant causes than immediate agitation by the Communists. The efforts of these outsiders were foredoomed to failure because, in the clash of cultures which they precipitated, the workers fought only against bad conditions which they had experienced, not for a new social order which they did not understand. Furthermore, the Communist challenge to political authority and orthodox religion united diverse elements in this society against the strikers and agitators. When mob violence and bloodshed resulted, the court trials which followed were concerned chiefly with questions of murder and heresy, not with the issue of labor’s right to organize.

As the detailed bibliography and numerous references to personal interviews indicate, Professor Pope has left no stone unturned in probing his subject. He has succeeded notably in his dispassionate analysis and interpretation. The book will hold the interest of historians equally with that of sociologists and other social scientists.

University of Virginia

LESTER J. CAPPON

Cordell Hull, A Biography. By Harold B. Hinton. With a Foreword by Sumner Welles. (Garden City, New York: Doubleday, Doran and Company, Inc., 1942. Pp. xiv, 377. \$3.00.)

James A. Farley, in *Behind the Ballots* (New York, 1938), labelled Hull the “most unselfish man I have ever met in politics” (p. 102), and Sumner Welles in the Foreword of this book has spoken of him as “the least self-seeking man I have ever known.” This biography supports these opinions concerning the personality of the Secretary of State.

Cordell Hull was born in 1871 in the Cumberland Mountains of Tennessee. His early inclination to read extensively and later to study law was encouraged by his parents and his teachers. In 1891 his formal education was completed with a law degree from Cumberland University and he forthwith hung out his shingle at Celina, Tennessee. In 1892 he was elected to the Tennessee legislature where he gained a knowledge of practical politics. During the Spanish-American War he was appointed captain of a company of volunteers and while in Cuba served as judge advocate and as inspector general of the District of Trinidad.

Appointed to the Tennessee circuit court in 1903, Hull was subsequently elected to that office and served for three years. In a three-man race for nomination to Congress this budding statesman won by 15 votes out of more than 15,500 cast. After entering Congress in December, 1907, he worked for years on plans for income and inheritance taxes before he saw those plans enacted into law.

During the early years of the First World War, Hull sought means of keeping the United States out of the conflict. By the end of the war he was advocating practical means of tariff reduction—ideas which he was able partially to put into effect later as Secretary of State. In 1920 he was not re-elected to Congress and was defeated for the chairmanship of the Democratic National Committee. He was given the latter office the next year and proved himself a capable party leader. In 1922 he returned to the House of Representatives where he remained until he was sent to the Senate. Since 1933, as Secretary of State, Hull has rendered his greatest service—that of an international liberal. In foresight and accomplishment he probably will rank among our half dozen best secretaries of state.

As a former member of the New York *Times* editorial staff, who for nine years covered the development of American foreign policy at the State Department and who attended all of Hull's Pan-American conferences, the author is well qualified to produce a book of permanent value on the Secretary of State. Major Hinton, now of the Air Corps Intelligence Section, has written in an interesting if not always in a scholarly manner. Naturally, perhaps, the best chapters are those that deal with the development of Hull's Pan-American program.

The author had a tendency to bring in irrelevant matter. For instance, in the chapter entitled "Father of the Income Tax," part or all of pages 137-39 are composed of "filler material." There are no footnotes and some omissions were noted in the index. These shortcomings, however, do not seriously mar a readable and enlightening book.

Bob Jones College

GEORGE C. OSBORN

Guide to the Manuscript Collections in the Archives of the North Carolina Historical Commission. By the North Carolina Historical Records Survey Project, Division of Community Service Programs, WPA. (Raleigh: The North Carolina Historical Commission, 1942. Pp. vi, 216. Mailing fee of 25 cents.)

This work is a guide to the manuscript collections of the North Carolina Historical Commission. Since the county records of North Carolina have already been listed in a three-volume work, there remains only the publication of a guide to the state archives to complete the listing of the holdings of the North Carolina Historical Commission. One difficult problem in preparing a guide to manuscripts of such an institution, which not only is the custodian of the state's archival records but also maintains a collection of other manuscript materials,

is one of definition. In short, what is an "archive" and what is a "manuscript"? Assuming that an archive is an official record and a manuscript a nonofficial or private record, it may be wondered why such material as entry 243, English Records, 1663-1883, was listed in a guide to manuscript materials. Since this material was obtained from the British Public Record Office it would appear that the proper place to list these documents would be in the guide to archival material. It is in connection with this entry that the date 1883 is a typographical error and probably should read 1783. A careful study of the guide would probably indicate other material which is mostly official in nature. A minor criticism could be offered in the establishing of complete entries for such items as a John Adams autograph (item 3), a typewritten copy of a Revolutionary record (item 6), as well as many others. It may have been better to group all such items as the papers become more numerous. *The Library of Congress Handbook* (1918) has handled this situation by grouping items from one to six pieces in a personal-miscellany class.

One is struck by the many excellent descriptive lists that were prepared by Dr. R. D. W. Connor while he was Secretary of the Historical Commission. It is apparent that useful as a guide may be for an overall picture of an institution's holdings, it is still necessary to do a great deal of analytical and descriptive listing in order to bring out the pertinent material in any extensive collection.

Virginia State Library

WILLIAM J. VAN SCHREEVEN

COMMUNICATIONS

August 19, 1942

THE MANAGING EDITOR OF THE JOURNAL OF SOUTHERN HISTORY:

Dr. Swearingen's review of *A Conscientious Turncoat: The Story of John M. Palmer, 1817-1900*, by George Thomas Palmer, in the *Journal of Southern History* for August, got under my skin.

Had Dr. Swearingen been content to damn the book as "dull and pedestrian" and "faulty in style and structure" I would have remarked—to myself—that opinions differ, but I would not have written a letter of protest. Two other features of the review impelled me to that.

One is Dr. Swearingen's repeated reference to George Thomas Palmer as the son of John M. Palmer. On pages 121 and 258 of *A Conscientious Turncoat* the author states explicitly that he is a grandson of his subject, and references on pages 176-77 and 283 point clearly to some relationship other than a filial one. Now, if Dr. Swearingen read the book so hurriedly that he missed these passages, I wonder if his unqualified condemnation is based on adequate familiarity?

The other pinprick is Dr. Swearingen's homily about amateur historians. History writing is a craft, and those without a union card—which I take to be a Ph.D. in history—need not apply. "History writing . . . is not done well except

by those who have training in it." Somehow, I have been under the impression that Francis Parkman and James Ford Rhodes and Albert J. Beveridge were fairly competent, and that Allan Nevins and Mark Sullivan and Marquis James were continuing the tradition worthily. And I have also been under the impression that some pretty dull stuff was to be found in doctoral dissertations.

After seventeen years of historical editing, and rather wide reading in American history, I can find no consistent relationship between graduate training in history and effective historical writing, and I am getting a little tired of the academicians' "no poaching" attitude.

PAUL M. ANGLE

October 28, 1942

TO THE MANAGING EDITOR OF THE JOURNAL OF SOUTHERN HISTORY:

Thank you for sending me the letter from Mr. Paul Angle about my review of *A Conscientious Turncoat*.

Mr. Angle's letter is correct on every point and it seems to me he should realize that he and I are on the same side. I think it is significant that nowhere in his letter does he actually take exception to the main point of my review, which was that the book was not an adequate piece of historical scholarship and writing. I read his letter in vain for any commitment from him as to the merits of the book. This seems to me conclusive.

I admit without blushing that I did not read all the book, and on this I am sure I will be with the majority. It was just plain bad luck, from my point of view, that the chapters I did not read were the ones in which the author identified himself, but it really is unimportant. There was no reason why I should read it all, and no damage was done by missing a generation of the Palmer family.

No one can know better than I do how dull professional history writing can be, and I could add a number of names to Mr. Angle's list of competent amateurs. A Ph.D. in history is certainly no guarantee of brilliant performance, and sometimes is quite the contrary. It is still true, however, that for every first-rate amateur one can find a dozen or more able professionals, which proves something. Possibly it proves that the amateurs who succeeded took pains first to learn the craft. Mr. Angle's direct quotation from my letter is not fair in that he omits the qualifying phrase which changes the whole meaning of the sentence.

But this is largely without point. It is clear that Mr. Angle and I are really in agreement, even about the merits of Dr. Palmer's book.

M. SWEARINGEN

Historical News and Notices

The Executive Council of the Southern Historical Association assembled in Atlanta, Georgia, on October 18 with the following members present: A. B. Moore of the University of Alabama, J. G. de Roulhac Hamilton and Fletcher M. Green of the University of North Carolina, James W. Patton of North Carolina State College, Benjamin B. Kendrick of the Woman's College, University of North Carolina, Minnie Clare Boyd of Mississippi State College for Women, William C. Binkley and Frank L. Owsley of Vanderbilt University, Ottis C. Skipper of Louisiana State Normal College, and Wendell H. Stephenson of Louisiana State University, substituting for Fred C. Cole.

The Council voted to accept Vanderbilt's proposal to assume sponsorship of the *Journal of Southern History* on substantially the same basis as Louisiana State University has been guaranteeing it in recent years. William C. Binkley was elected managing editor and Henry L. Swint, also of Vanderbilt University, was designated editorial associate. The transfer of the magazine will become effective as of January 1, 1943.

The following new members of the Board of Editors were elected to succeed Walter B. Posey and W. Neil Franklin, whose terms expire at the end of the calendar year: Wesley F. Craven of New York University and Wendell H. Stephenson.

As the 1942 annual meeting of the Association will not be held, the Council directed that officers for 1943 be elected by mail ballot. The officers to be chosen are vice-president, secretary-treasurer, and three members of the Executive Council. According to a provision of the constitution, the vice-president, J. G. de Roulhac Hamilton, automatically succeeds to the presidency. The question of holding an annual meeting in 1943 was left in abeyance, pending future developments in travel facilities.

PERSONAL

Most of the editorial work on the present issue of the *Journal* was completed by Dr. Cole before his departure on October 1 for the Princeton Naval School where he will receive special training as an ensign. The issue has been completed by the Editorial Associate, with the assistance of a former graduate student, Mrs. Edgar A. (Kathryn) Schuler.

The Managing Editor and the Editorial Associate desire to express their gratefulness to the members of the Association, the Executive Council, and the

Board of Editors for their generous co-operation through a period of eight years. We wish for our successors at Vanderbilt University a continuation of that spirit of mutual confidence and helpfulness that has permeated the Association since its founding in 1934. The Association is to be congratulated upon the selection of Dr. Binkley as managing editor and Dr. Swint as editorial associate. Their sound scholarship, critical judgment, and meticulous method provide all the qualifications requisite for successful editing.

E. Merton Coulter has been appointed professor of American history at the University of Texas to occupy the place left vacant by the death of Charles W. Ramsdell. Dr. Coulter will assume his new duties at the beginning of the second semester. Other new appointees at the University of Texas are Henry Nash Smith of Southern Methodist University and William Reynolds Braisted of the University of Chicago, the latter to succeed Allan B. Cole, who has accepted a position at Oberlin College.

Walter Prescott Webb, University of Texas, has accepted the Harmsworth Professorship in American History at Oxford, England, for the year. H. Bailey Carroll of North Texas Agricultural College will take his classes and also the editorship of the *Southwestern Historical Quarterly* during Dr. Webb's absence.

James W. Patton, Converse College, editor of the *Proceedings of the South Carolina Historical Association*, has been appointed associate professor of history and political science at North Carolina State College at Raleigh.

Ellery Hall has returned to the University of Kentucky after a year's leave of absence.

Philip Davidson, Agnes Scott College, has been appointed professor of history and dean of the graduate school at Vanderbilt University to succeed John E. Pomfret who has recently become president of William and Mary College. Catherine Strateman Sims has been made assistant professor of history at Agnes Scott.

Eugene E. Pfaff, who has been studying in New York, and Christiana McFadyen, who has been studying in Chicago, have returned to the Woman's College of the University of North Carolina after a year's leave of absence.

Lillian A. Kibler has been designated acting head of the history department at Converse College.

J. J. Mathers, University of Mississippi, has been granted leave to become associate historian in the Quartermaster General's Corps, Washington. His work at the University of Mississippi will be taken over by Francis G. James, formerly of Arkansas College.

Robert D. Meade, Randolph Macon Woman's College, has been granted a sabbatical leave for the session 1942-1943. The publication of his biography of

Judah P. Benjamin, which has been delayed for some time, is now definitely set by the Oxford Press for early 1943.

On September 21 the annual convention of the American Legion, meeting in Kansas City, re-elected Thomas M. Owen, Jr., Chief, Division of Veterans' Administrative Archives, The National Archives, for the twelfth consecutive time as national historian of that organization.

David A. Lockmiller, former head of the department of history and political science at North Carolina State College, became the president of the University of Chattanooga in September.

Announcement has been made of the appointment of Ottis C. Skipper of The Citadel as associate professor of history at the Louisiana State Normal College.

J. C. Bonner, research assistant at the University of North Carolina, has returned to his position as professor of history at West Georgia College.

Anna Greene Smith has been granted a year's leave from Louisiana Polytechnic Institute to study at the University of North Carolina. She has a fellowship with the University Social Science Council.

Many have been granted leaves of absence to participate in the war effort: Holden Furber, University of Texas, to engage in work in Washington connected with the war; William K. Church, University of Kentucky, to go into the service of the Signal Corps; John P. Ramsay and C. W. Williams, University of Alabama, the former to be an instructor at an air field in Long Beach, California, the latter to accept a captain's commission in the Intelligence Division of the air service; Jack Allen, State College, Richmond, Kentucky, to serve in the navy; and Charles B. Clark, West Georgia College, to serve as second lieutenant in the Marine Corps.

Joseph C. Sitterson, in army service since April, will soon return to the University of North Carolina.

Howard K. Beale is on leave of absence from the University of North Carolina for the fall quarter to work with the Friends Society.

Henry S. Stroupe, Wake Forest College, and Lewis E. Atherton, University of Missouri, have been promoted to the rank of associate professor. Thomas D. Clark, University of Kentucky, John E. McGee, Louisiana Polytechnic Institute, and Richard G. Stone, Converse College, have been promoted to the rank of professor. Dr. Clark has been designated acting head of the history department at the University of Kentucky.

New appointments for the fall session include: Mack Swearingen, Elmira College; Bernard Weber and Allen Going, University of Alabama; Oscar S.

Dooley, Millsaps College; Daisy Parker, Florida State College for Women; Stuart Noblin, Davis and Elkins College; Weymouth T. Jordan, Alabama Polytechnic Institute; David M. Potter, Yale University; Elizabeth Massey, Flora MacDonald College; Nell Hines, Brenau College; J. Lyle Hill and Lester C. Dickinson, The Citadel; and Edwin L. Williams, Mercer University.

The Archivist of the United States has announced the appointment to the staff of The National Archives of Dan M. Lacy, formerly state director of the Historical Records Survey in North Carolina and consultant for the Federal Historical Records Survey; Adeline V. Barry, formerly secretary of the Joint Committee on Materials for Research of the American Council of Learned Societies and the Social Science Research Council and more recently executive secretary of the Experimental Division of Library Co-operation of the Library of Congress; and Stuart Portner, formerly state supervisor of the Michigan Historical Records Survey. Other personnel changes include the transfer of Vernon G. Setser, of the Office of the Director of Reference Service, to the position of senior historian in the Office of the Quartermaster General in the War Department, and the commissioning of the following members of the staff who have been called to military duty: Asa M. Thornton, second lieutenant in the Quartermaster Corps of the army; James Minogue, lieutenant in the Hydrographic Office of the navy; Daniel F. Noll and Jesse S. Douglas, captains in the Adjutant General's Office of the army.

The Social Science Research Council has announced the following Southern Grant-in-Aid Appointees for the year 1942-1943: William Clarence Askew, University of Arkansas, for the completion of a study of America and the Great Powers, 1871-1914; Paul Barnett, University of Tennessee, for the completion of an analysis of state programs for industrial development in thirteen southern states; Rudolph Leopold Bieseke, University of Texas, for the completion of a study of the life and career of Bernard E. Bee with particular emphasis on the political history of Texas, 1836-1846; Gordon Thomas Chappell, Newberry College, for the completion of a study of land speculation in the Old Southwest; Alexander Taylor Edelmann, University of Kentucky, for the completion of a study of the effects of the Tennessee Valley Authority program of public ownership of power on local government; Donald Harvard Morrison, Louisiana State University, for the completion of a study of selected local institutional developments with emphasis on town-meeting government; Lester Fields Sheffy, West Texas State College, for the completion of a history of the colonization of West Texas; James W. Silver, University of Mississippi, for the completion of a study of civilian morale in the Confederacy; Earl E. Warner, University of Mississippi, for the completion of a study of county health departments in Mississippi.

Among other Social Science Research Council Grant-in-Aid Appointees are: Philip Selznick, Columbia University, for field training in the administrative

procedures of the Tennessee Valley Authority; Homer L. Hitt, Louisiana State University, for the completion of a study of the impact of the war on the redistribution of population of Louisiana; Frank L. Owsley, Vanderbilt University, for the completion of a study of the economic and social structure of Georgia, 1785-1860.

HISTORICAL SOCIETIES

The North Carolina Society of County Historians met June 14 at Chapel Hill to discuss what the program of their organization should be during the war.

The Hall of History (the state historical museum under the administration of the Historical Commission of North Carolina) has adapted its program to war conditions. Plans have been made for protecting the most valuable objects in case of air raids, special exhibits in connection with the war and civilian defense have been arranged, and the museum has been kept open on Saturday and Sunday afternoons and on holidays. With the opening of new military areas in the vicinity of Raleigh and with the rapid increase in the number of men at Fort Bragg, there has been a marked growth in the number of service men visiting the Hall of History, especially on week ends.

Officers and directors of the Florida Historical Society elected at the fortieth annual meeting of the Society, held in St. Augustine last March, were Herbert Lamson, Jacksonville, president, who has served for many years as president or director of the Jacksonville Historical Society; John B. Stetson, Jr., Deland, first vice-president; Gaines R. Wilson, Miami, second vice-president; Albert C. Mauncy, St. Augustine, recording secretary and treasurer; and Watt Marchman, St. Augustine, corresponding secretary and librarian. Directors elected were: Mrs. Millar Wilson, Jacksonville, at large; Mrs. Roger W. Babson, Babson Park, First Congressional District; Daisy Parker, Tallahassee, Third Congressional District; and Randall Chase, Sanford, Fifth Congressional District.

The Florida Historical Society commemorated the one-hundred-and-twenty-first anniversary of the transfer of East Florida from Spain to the United States, on July 10, by displaying a special exhibition in the library of the Society, located in St. Augustine. Many rare items pertaining to the transfer and the early territorial period of Florida history were displayed for the first time. Of special interest was the sword of Colonel Robert Butler, who was commissioned by the United States to receive East Florida from Spain. This sword was presented to the Society a week before the exhibit by Colonel Butler's grandchildren, Mrs. Ellen Dorsey and Dr. W. E. Lewis of Tallahassee. Another unusual item was a very valuable, original copy of the printed proclamation issued by the Spanish Governor José Coppinger to the inhabitants of East Florida on July 7, 1821, three days before the transfer.

At the second annual meeting of the Historical Association of Southern

Florida, held at the University of Miami, Coral Gables, on July 21, the following officers were elected: Dr. John C. Gifford, president; Mrs. Henry J. Egger, first vice-president; George C. Estill, second vice-president; Justin P. Havee, recording secretary; Gaines R. Wilson, corresponding secretary; Thomas P. Caldwell, treasurer; Dr. C. W. Tebeau, editor of the journal *Tequesta*; and Mrs. George W. Rosner, librarian. Twenty-one directors were also elected.

At the 1942 banquet of the Society for the History of the Germans in Maryland, Dr. Arthur D. Graeff spoke on "The Germans in the Revolutionary War." This Society is well on its way to achieving the goal of its founders in 1886, namely, to publish in book form the definitive account of the Germans in Maryland. This volume, by Dr. Dieter Cunz, is expected to appear next year.

BIBLIOGRAPHICAL

Arrangements have been made with the publishers of the Beverage Fund publications to offer at much reduced prices certain volumes published by the Fund. This offer is made in the interest of securing distribution to interested individuals and institutions, especially libraries. The supply of practically all of the issues listed below is distinctly limited and the volumes will be allowed to go out of print when the stock is exhausted. The following volumes, with their original price in parentheses, are presently available:

Barnes, Gilbert H., and Dumond, Dwight L. (eds.): *Letters of Theodore Dwight Weld, Angelina Grimké Weld and Sarah Grimké, 1822-1844*, 2 vols. (\$10.00)

Binkley, William C. (ed.): *Official Correspondence of the Texan Revolution, 1835-1836*, 2 vols. (\$10.00)

Case, Lynn M. (ed.): *French Opinion on the United States and Mexico, 1860-1867* (\$7.00)

Dumond, Dwight L. (ed.): *Letters of James Gillespie Birney, 1831-1857*, 2 vols. (\$10.00)

Dumond, Dwight L. (ed.): *Southern Editorials on Secession* (\$4.00)

Labaree, Leonard W. (ed.): *Royal Instructions to British Colonial Governors, 1670-1776*, 2 vols. (\$10.00)

Pargellis, Stanley M.: *Military Affairs in North America, 1748-1765* (\$8.00)

A complete set of all the above list is offered at \$15.00, any three titles at \$7.00, and any two titles at \$5.00. Checks or money orders should be made payable to the American Historical Association and orders should be addressed to the office of the Executive Secretary, Room 274, Library of Congress Annex, Washington, D. C.

The library of the University of Missouri has received one hundred eighty-eight file drawers collected by the Missouri WPA Historical Records Commission and Writers' Project.

The Historical Records Survey, a Work Projects Administration program which was begun in the winter of 1935-1936 for the "discovery, preservation, and listing of basic materials for research in the history of the United States," was terminated on June 30, 1942. Sponsored in North Carolina from the beginning by the Historical Commission, the Survey successfully terminated the more important phases of its work in the field of county records and manuscripts. The inventories of county records were completed and published by the Historical Commission as *The Historical Records of North Carolina, The County Records*, 3 vols. (1938-1939). Guides to the manuscript collections of the Duke University Library, the Southern Historical Collection of the University of North Carolina, and the North Carolina Historical Commission were published, and also a guide to the archives of the Moravian Church in America, Southern Province (in Salem). In addition, 76,721 early American imprints were listed; 4,643 individual churches were surveyed and 7 denominational inventories were published; 7,035 cemeteries were surveyed, including 268,833 individual tombstones, and cards for 244,487 tombstones from 6,535 cemeteries were typed and filed in the search room of the Historical Commission; 1,350 maps were listed; a guide to public vital statistics records in the state and guides to 14 state agencies were published; assistance was given to the State Committee on the Conservation of Cultural Resources; and many archives and manuscripts in the custody of the Historical Commission and other agencies were arranged and classified. A bibliography of the publications of the Historical Records Survey and also of the Survey of Federal Archives will be included in the bulletin, "The North Carolina Historical Commission: Forty Years of Public Service," soon to be published by the Commission.

The North Carolina Historical Commission has recently acquired the Heriot Clarkson Papers, consisting of twenty-two scrapbooks, 1882-1941; ledger, Heriot Clarkson and Company, September, 1882; *The Libertarian* (Greenville, S. C.), Vol. II, No. 1, January, 1924; Record Book, seventieth birthday, August 18, 1933; clippings, letters, telegrams, etc.; file of personal correspondence, one box; and a carbon copy of Judge Clarkson's will. It has also received fifty-two cartons and thirty-six volumes of Franklin County records, including court minutes, wills, inventories, civil and state papers, and other miscellaneous records; twelve letter files, three cartons, and one basket of North Carolina Conference for Social Service Papers.

The Virginia Historical Society has received a collection of manuscripts relating to the Confederacy; "A Memorial Discourse on the Death of Robert E. Lee," by the Rev. T. V. Moore, D.D., Nashville, October, 1870; and *Virginia Colonial Abstracts, King & Queen County, Virginia*, Vol. XV, compiled by Beverly Fleet.

The Oklahoma Historical Society has received from Dr. Charles Evans of Oklahoma City a collection numbering several thousand items covering the

period from 1905 to the present. It consists of clippings, pamphlets, addresses, articles, programs, letters, and pictures of individuals who have participated in the educational advancement of Oklahoma.

The Georgia Department of Archives and History has announced that through the efforts of Mr. John B. Wilson, Secretary of State, it has acquired and is operating one of the four existing Barrow laminators for the restoration of documents.

The Historical Commission of South Carolina has received positive photostats of the John Tobler Papers together with a typed German transcription and complete translation. In its February, 1939, issue, the *Journal* printed an abbreviated version of these papers, embracing an account of Swiss settlers in South Carolina in 1737.

The National Archives has received during recent months, partly as a result of wartime pressure for office and storage space, exceptionally large quantities of noncurrent Federal records. Among the larger, more important groups received are records of a score of customhouses, 1773-1936; the main body of records of the Coast Guard and its predecessors, the Revenue-Cutter Service, the Life-Saving Service, and the Bureau of Lighthouses, 1789-1942; and records of the Public Health Service and its predecessors, 1833-1939. Notable among the many groups received from the War and Navy departments are records of military departments and divisions in the Middle and Far West, 1858-1921; the World War Selective Service System, 1917-1919; the Planning Branch of the Office of the Assistant Secretary of War, 1922-1934; and the Navy Department Bureaus of Engineering, 1910-1940, and Construction and Repair, 1896-1940. Other important groups received include the principal files of the Biological Survey, 1907-1938; the Commissioner of Fish and Fisheries and the Fisheries Bureau, 1894-1940; the Bureau of Agricultural Chemistry and Engineering and its predecessors, 1868-1942; the Office of Experiment Stations of the Department of Agriculture, 1888-1932; the Commodity Credit Corporation, 1933-1940; the Federal Trade Commission, 1915-1938; WPA Research and Records Projects and their predecessors, 1934-1942; and the Mixed Claims Commission, United States and Germany, 1922-1941.

As a result of these and earlier accessions, The National Archives now has approximately 80 per cent of all Federal records in the District of Columbia that are more than 50 years old, exclusive of those of the General Accounting Office. More than 90 per cent of such records of the Senate, the State, War, Justice, and Labor departments, and the Veterans' Administration, and between 70 and 90 per cent of such records of the Navy and Interior departments and the Civil Service Commission have been received.

Chief among recent manuscript acquisitions of the Emory University Library is a collection of more than thirty thousand letters and papers from the files of

the late Bishop Warren A. Candler which has been presented to the library by the Candler family. The papers present a thorough picture of the activities of the Southern Methodist Church from 1898 to 1938. They include many letters and documents relating to the history of Emory College of which Candler was president from 1888 to 1898 and of Emory University of which he was chancellor from 1914 to 1922. Many aspects of the social history of the South in the first four decades of the twentieth century are touched on in the collection, and letters from numerous prominent figures of the period are present.

Collections presented to the library of the Florida Historical Society during recent weeks include the Pleasant Woodson White Collection (1839-1894), consisting of several hundred items pertaining principally to the Civil War. Judge White of Quincy, Florida, was in command of the Subsistence Department of Florida between 1863 and the close of the war. There are included in the collection hundreds of letters, original and in letter press books, official and private, written and received during this period. The collection was presented to the Society by Calvin Horace Curry of Quincy, in behalf of the White family.

Other gifts of special importance are: a newspaper file of the *Quincy* (Florida) *Herald*, 1887-1892, donated to the Society by Philip S. May of Jacksonville, in behalf of the May family, as a memorial to his father, Frank Pierce May (1852-1937); a large collection of Florida materials from the library of the late Senator A. M. Taylor of St. Augustine, gift of his daughter, Mrs. Verle A. Pope; and hundreds of files of Florida newspapers, 1900 to 1940, presented by the University of Florida Library.

Much source material relating to the state of Maryland will be found listed in the *Sixth Annual Report of the Archivist of the Hall of Records* (Annapolis: State of Maryland, 1941, pp. 38). Similar material for the state of Mississippi will be found in the *Biennial Report of the Mississippi Department of Archives and History, July 1, 1939-June 30, 1941* (Jackson: 1941, pp. 31), edited by William D. McCain. Of importance to Virginia and Pennsylvania historians is *New Market, Virginia, Imprints, 1806-1876, A Check-List* (Charlottesville: Alderman Library, 1942, pp. 36), edited by Lester J. Cappon and Ira V. Brown. Besides naming the publications of the Henkel press, this check list indicates in what libraries they may be located.

Recent publications of The National Archives include *The Role of the Archivist in Public Administration*, by Helen L. Chatfield, and *Old Records in a New War*, by Edward G. Campbell. The study of *Historical Units of Agencies of the First World War*, by Elizabeth B. Drewry, recently issued as a processed document, has been expanded and published as No. 4 of the *Bulletins* of The National Archives. Other processed documents recently issued include *The Protection of Federal Records Against Hazards of War* and *Archives and the War*, both by Collas G. Harris, and *Records Administration and the War*, by

Emmett J. Leahy, reprinted from *Military Affairs*. Copies of these publications are available upon request from The National Archives.

Records of The Columbia Historical Society of Washington, D. C., 1940-1941, Vols. XLII-XLIII (Washington: The Columbia Historical Society, 1942, pp. viii, 309, illustrations), edited by Newman F. McGirr, contains several brief articles chiefly of local interest to northern Virginia and the District of Columbia. Particular mention might be made of the bibliographical article by Elizabeth Bethel, "Material in the National Archives Relating to the Early History of the District of Columbia."

Colonel William Fleming on the Virginia Frontier, 1755-1783 (Privately printed, 1942, pp. 211), by William D. Hoyt, Jr., is the biography of a man not in himself historically outstanding but important rather as the "representative of the type of cultured gentleman who took the lead in the development and protection of the frontier region before, during, and after the stirring events of the war with Great Britain. He was one of those who occupied the foremost positions, civil and military, and to whom western Virginia and Kentucky were indebted for continued existence and growth." This account of Fleming's life makes full use of unpublished as well as published sources.

Kentucky Colonel—New Vintage (Lexington: privately printed, 1942, pp. 11), by Clement Eaton, is a character sketch of J. Winston Coleman, Jr., Winburn Farm, Lexington, Kentucky, which first appeared in the *Southern Literary Messenger* for March, 1941. It presents a contrast between the traditional type of Kentucky colonel and the modern machine-age version.

Peabody College has been an outstanding force in the educational development of the South. In *The Historical Background of Peabody College* (Nashville: George Peabody College for Teachers, 1941, pp. 41) is traced the development of this institution over a period of one hundred and fifty years, from its earliest beginnings as Davidson Academy, then as Cumberland College, and as University of Nashville to its present status as George Peabody College for Teachers.

Contained in *Papers in Illinois History and Transactions for the Year 1940* (Springfield: Illinois State Historical Society, 1941, pp. x, 217) is a study entitled "Rivers that Meet in Egypt," by Barbara Burr Hubbs, which deals with the exploration and settlement of Lower Illinois, and particularly with the hazards and glamor of travel on the rivers. Only published sources are used. "Egypt's Cultural Contributions," by G. W. Smith, attempts to describe the cultural background of the early southern settlers to Illinois.

Like many others, Norman W. Caldwell in his *The French in the Mississippi Valley, 1740-1750* (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1941, pp. 113, \$2.00) makes very free with the term Mississippi Valley. The book deals largely with

the French within the Great Angle formed by the Ohio and Mississippi rivers, and the author is faced with the common problem of securing a suitable name to describe this area. The brief references to the French in the area south of Cairo, Illinois, do not justify the title. The chapters on "Political and Financial Administration" and "Population and Industry" will be very useful. In dealing with the problem of Indian relations, covered in the last third of the book, the author shows an unwarranted tendency to question the motives of the Jesuits involved. Occasional errors of fact in connection with Father La Richardie are to be found. The Diary of Father Pierre Potier was not consulted. [Edward R. Ott]

The Antislavery Controversy in Missouri, 1819-1865 (St. Louis: Washington University, 1942, pp. 53, bibliography), by Benjamin Merkel, throws new light on the abolition movement in general and "relates for the first time the development of opposition to Negro servitude in Missouri from 1819 to 1865."

Gúadal P'a: *The Journal of Lieutenant J. W. Abert, from Bent's Fort to St. Louis in 1845* (Canyon, Texas: The Panhandle-Plains Historical Society, 1941, pp. 121, illustrations, map, \$3.50), edited by H. Bailey Carroll, is "the report of the reconnaissance executed under the command of Lieutenant James William Abert of the United States Army in 1845." Why this important contribution to Anglo-American exploration of the Southwest has received so little attention, the editor, who has done an extremely careful and thorough job in this work, finds "difficult to explain." Abert's *Journal* not only added to the geographical knowledge of the region and contributed invaluable testimony on the tribe of the Kiowas, but it also contained the account of the first expedition upon mules across the plains. "Perhaps," says the editor, "his successes were partly instrumental in making the mule traditional with the United States Army." The usefulness of this work is seriously hampered by the extremely small type in which it is printed.

To the long list of travelers' reports of America may be added *The Diaries of Donald MacDonald, 1824-1826* (Vol. XIV, No. 2 of *Indiana Historical Society Publications*, Indianapolis: Indiana Historical Society, 1942, pp. 147-379), edited by Carolina Dale Snedeker. MacDonald, a Scotchman, made two visits to the United States between 1824 and 1826, chiefly because of his interest in the New Harmony community. On his first visit he spent a night at Monticello. During his second visit to New Harmony, MacDonald severed his connection with the group. The remainder of the diary describes a journey down the Mississippi, and his visits to New Orleans, Havana, and Charleston.

The purpose of *The Walter Clinton Jackson Essays in the Social Sciences* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1942, pp. xii, 245, \$3.00), by members of the Faculty of the Woman's College of the University of North Carolina, edited by Vera Largent, is to honor Dr. Walter Clinton Jackson, who

was, from 1909 to 1932, head of the department of history, head of the department of history and economics, and chairman of the faculty of social science; and since 1934, dean of administration of the Woman's College of the University of North Carolina. Members of the social science faculty have contributed papers in the fields of history, political science, philosophy, psychology, economics, sociology, and geography. The thread that holds together the various subjects treated is "a concern with democracy as a way of life and with its successes or failures in the region, the nation, and the world." The papers in this volume of interest to historians of the southern region are "Impressment during the American Revolution," by Elizabeth Cometti; "The Colonial Status of the South," by Benjamin Burks Kendrick; "Garner versus Kitchin: A Study of Craft and Statecraft," by Alex Mathews Arnett; "The Economic Future of the Southeast," by Albert S. Keister; and "Twentieth Century South-wide Civic and Lay Organizations for Human Welfare," by Lyda Gordon Shivers.

In *Weather Observers and Observations at Charleston, South Carolina, 1670-1871* (Reprinted from the *Historical Appendix of The Year Book of The City of Charleston for the Year 1940*, pp. 190-257, illustrations), Robert Croom Aldredge has shown how the scientific study of meteorological conditions in Charleston grew out of the desire to determine just what effect weather has on the human body, or more specifically, just what sort of weather brought on the dread yellow fever, smallpox, and other diseases. Dr. John Lining, a Scotchman who emigrated to Charleston in 1730, began in April, 1737, to record his barometrical observations twice a day. In 1748, having experienced his fourth epidemic of yellow fever, he wrote an account of the disease and a description of the weather, giving rainfall, temperature, and direction of the wind. Another doctor of Scottish birth and associated with Lining, Lionel Chalmers, in 1776 published a book on the same subject, *An Account of the Weather and Diseases of South Carolina*. In 1789 the Medical Society of South Carolina was organized, and about two years later began keeping a meteorological record. From 1812 until 1862 this was the work of Dr. Joseph Johnson. At that time it was believed that the fevers originated and were disseminated from the "miasmata of the city's drains and sewers," as the epidemic usually followed westerly winds which, in the words of Dr. Johnson, "come heated by the extent of continent over which they have passed and are charged with the variety of miasmata acquired from the Swamps and Rice Fields which lye in that direction" (p. 240). The work of other less important meteorological observers is also noted. This little volume bears evidence of much painstaking research on the part of its author.

Of *The Essays of Henry Timrod* (Athens: University of Georgia Press, 1942, pp. viii, 184, \$2.50), edited by Edd Winfield Parks, the historian will find some interest in "Literature in the South." This essay, first published in 1859, describes the quandary of the southern author whose work is either ignored or abused not only by northern critics but also by southern critics. Timrod presents

a picture of the Southerners of his day—"though an educated, we are a provincial, and not a highly cultivated people"—and dismisses as absurd the idea of "Southernism in literature."

A labor of love on the part of the DAR Chapter of Laurens County, Georgia, is *The Official History of Laurens County, Georgia, 1807-1941* (Dublin, Georgia: John Laurens Chapter, Daughters of the American Revolution, 1941, pp. xiv, 546, illustrations, appendices), edited by Bertha Sheppard Hart. Although abounding in illustrations of ancestors, schools, churches, and county court-houses, there is only one inadequate sketch map of Laurens County, and no map identifying the county in its relation to the state of Georgia. An appendix contains early wills and marriages, taken from the original records, and family histories written by members of the families concerned. The history depends largely on legends and tradition, the sources usually not given or, if given, inadequate. Scattered throughout the text are muster rolls, land lottery lists, tax lists, various letters, etc. Of the 546 pages of this volume, only six are devoted to a chapter entitled "Negroes in Laurens County," although 40.9 per cent of the population in the county, according to the 1940 census, is Negro.

As no accurate copy of the Charter of Georgia has been available in the published sources, this need has been filled by Albert B. Saye in *Georgia's Charter of 1732* (Athens: University of Georgia Press, 1942, pp. 63). Part I contains "a purely factual account of the Charter." Part II presents the original document on one side of the page with the transcription opposite it.

Irene Mound Site, Chatham County, Georgia (Athens: University of Georgia Press, 1941, pp. xvi, 100, illustrations), by Joseph Caldwell, Catherine McCann, and Frederick S. Hulse, is the report of an archaeological investigation of one of the largest mounds on the Georgia coast. All of this material is prehistoric, although "the last occupation of Irene continued almost to the historic period." The authors point out that "No specific connection is known between the inhabitants of the Irene site and the Indians encountered by the early explorers of the Georgia and South Carolina coasts. . . . However, the work of Swanton . . . permits a tentative identification of the site with the immediate culture area and a comparison with specific groups of Indians who are known to have lived in the region."

An abundantly illustrated and detailed description of an historic building in Natchez will be found in *The Story of Connelly's Tavern on Ellicott Hill* (Jackson: 1942, pp. 51), by Pearl Vivian Guyton. This building, in an extremely run-down condition, was bought by the Natchez Garden Club in 1935, and has since been restored to its former beauty.

L'Histoire Merveilleuse de La Louisiane Française, Chronique des XVII^e et XVIII^e Siècles et de la Cession aux Etats-Unis (New York: Editions de la Mai-

son Française, Inc., 1941, pp. 374), by Régine Hubert-Robert, begins with the discovery of the Mississippi and the explorations of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, and continues through the eighteenth century with the founding of New Orleans, troubles with the Indians, the cession to Spain, etc., concluding with the return of Louisiana to France and its final cession to the United States.

The Maritime Provinces of British North America and the American Revolution (Sackville, New Brunswick: Busy East Press, Ltd., no date, pp. 172), by Wilfred Brenton Kerr, while not directly related to history of the South, furnishes a background for the Acadian history of Louisiana.

To those historians of the South who may on occasion desire a sojourn in another vineyard, attention is called to the two-volume *History of History Writing* (New York: The Macmillan Company, 1942, xvi, 676, ix, 674, frontispiece, \$14.00), by the late James Westfall Thompson, with the collaboration of Bernard J. Holm. The work is not a history of all history writing, as the title implies, for it embraces only the historiography of Old World historians. Within that scope it is a monumental contribution.

ARTICLES ON THE STATES OF THE UPPER SOUTH

"Barbara Frietschie," by Dorothy Mackay Quynn and William Rogers Quynn, in the *Maryland Historical Magazine* (September).

"The Names of the Great Lawyers on the Frieze of the Baltimore Supreme Bench Court Room," by Henry D. Harlan, *ibid.*

"New Light on Three Episodes of the British Invasion of Maryland in 1814," by Ralph Robinson, *ibid.*

"Reading Interests of Maryland Planters and Merchants 1700-1776," continued, by Joseph Towne Wheeler, *ibid.*

"Some Friends of 'Ye Friends in Ye Ministry,'" by Emerson B. Roberts, *ibid.*

"History of the English-German Schools in Baltimore," by Ernest J. Becker, in *Society for the History of the Germans in Maryland, Twenty-fifth Report* (1942).

"DeKalb and Maryland," by Dieter Cunz, *ibid.*

"German Settlements on the Eastern Shore of Maryland," by Arthur L. Davis, *ibid.*

"What's in a Street Name?" by Charles H. Miegel, *ibid.*

"The Fish and Fisheries of Colonial Virginia," by John C. Pearson, in the *William and Mary College Quarterly Historical Magazine* (July).

"An Old Wharf at Yorktown, Virginia," by Charles E. Hatch, Jr., *ibid.*

"Augustin Hermann, Origin and Early Events," by Dieter Cunz, in *Tyler's Quarterly Historical and Genealogical Magazine* (July).

"James Abercromby and the Virginia Governorship in 1757," by Charles F. Mullett, *ibid.*

"John Tyler, Stalwart Son of Old Virginia," by Judge Blake C. Cook, *ibid.*

- "Red House," by Francis Lee Thurman, in the *Proceedings of the Rockbridge Historical Society* (1941).
- "Borden's Grant," by E. Pendleton Tompkins, *ibid.*
- "War and Work; or, Side-Lights on Lee and Jackson," by William Couper, *ibid.*
- "Yesteryears of Falling Spring Church," by W. Twyman Williams, *ibid.*
- "Rockbridge and Its County Seat," by Mrs. Charles McCulloch, *ibid.*
- "The Life Story of Mary Moore of Abb's Valley," by Mrs. Ernest A. Sale, *ibid.*
- "The History of New Providence Church," by Walter F. Dice, *ibid.*
- "Virginia Negro Soldiers and Seamen in the American Revolution," by L. P. Jackson, in the *Journal of Negro History* (July).
- "Batts and Fallam and the Kanawha," by R. Woodrow Castle, in *West Virginia History* (July).
- "Poor Relief Education (Kanawha County, Virginia, 1818-1847)," by Charles H. Ambler, *ibid.*
- "The Free Negro in the Economic Life of Ante-Bellum North Carolina," Part I, by John Hope Franklin, in the *North Carolina Historical Review* (July).
- "Squire Boone, 1744-1815," by Willard R. Jillson, in the *Filson Club History Quarterly* (July).
- "George Rogers Clark—A Mason," by Allen M. Reager, *ibid.*
- "Kentucky Through Fifteen Decades of Statehood," by Colonel Edgar Erskine Hume, in the *Register of the Kentucky State Historical Society* (July).
- "Bryan, a Pioneer Family," by Edward Bryan, *ibid.*
- "Some Institutional and Statistical Aspects of Slavery in Tennessee," by Chase C. Mooney, in the *Tennessee Historical Quarterly* (September).
- "The Career of John Bell as Congressman from Tennessee, 1827-1841," by Norman L. Parks, *ibid.*
- "Generals Francis Nash and William Lee Davidson," by Samuel C. Williams, *ibid.*
- "The James Boys and Missouri Politics," by William A. Settle, Jr., in the *Missouri Historical Review* (July).
- "Missouri—Heir of Southern Tradition and Individuality," by Floyd C. Shoemaker, *ibid.*
- "The Franklin Mill and Distillery," by Lilburn A. Kingsbury, *ibid.*
- "Reminiscences of Old Stonewall," by George W. Burris, in the *Chronicles of Oklahoma* (June).
- "Range Riding in Oklahoma," by Ralph H. Records, *ibid.*
- "Notes on the History of Old Greer County," by Lem H. Tittle, *ibid.*

DOCUMENTS AND COMPILATIONS ON THE STATES OF THE UPPER SOUTH

- "The Baltimore Germans and the Oath of Allegiance in 1778," edited by Dieter Cunz, in the *Society for the History of the Germans in Maryland, Twenty-fifth Report* (1942).

- "A Letter from George Washington to Andrew Barnaby, 1761," contributed by Henry Field, in the *William and Mary College Quarterly Historical Magazine* (July).
- "The Doehla Journal," translated by Robert J. Tilden, *ibid.*
- "Mazzei's Correspondence with the Grand Duke of Tuscany during His American Mission," by Howard R. Marraro, *ibid.*
- "Some Orange County Virginia Birth Records," contributed by George H. S. King, *ibid.*
- "Reconstruction Letters from North Carolina," VIII, "Letters to Carl Schurz," edited by James A. Padgett, *ibid.*
- "Copies of Extant Wills from Counties Whose Records Have Been Destroyed," by George Harrison Sanford King, in *Tyler's Quarterly Historical and Genealogical Magazine* (July).
- "Epistles from the Springs of Virginia," edited by William D. Hoyt, Jr., in *West Virginia History* (July).
- "West Virginians in the American Revolution," continued, assembled and edited by Ross B. Johnston, *ibid.*
- "Samuel McDowell's Letters to Andrew Reid, Thirteen Letters—1783-1814—on Sundry Subjects by One of the Framers of Kentucky's First Constitution, 1792," edited by Otto A. Rothert, in the *Filson Club History Quarterly* (July).
- "A Memoir of Lexington and Its Vicinity," continued, by William A. Leavy, in the *Register of the Kentucky State Historical Society* (July).
- "Kentucky Marriages and Obituaries," continued, compiled and edited by G. Glenn Clift, *ibid.*
- "Albert Sidney Johnston in Texas, Letters to Relatives in Kentucky, 1847-1860," edited by Arthur Marvin Shaw, *ibid.*
- "Tennessee Volunteers in the Seminole Campaign of 1836; The Diary of Henry Hollingsworth," edited by Stanley F. Horn, in the *Tennessee Historical Quarterly* (September).
- "Record of Commissions of Officers in the Tennessee Militia, 1796-1801," continued, compiled by Mrs. John Trotwood Moore, *ibid.*
- "Oklahoma County Histories," continued, by J. L. Rader, in the *Chronicles of Oklahoma* (June).

ARTICLES ON THE STATES OF THE LOWER SOUTH

- "The South Carolina Constitution of 1865 as a Democratic Document," by John Harold Wolfe, in the *Proceedings of the South Carolina Historical Association* (1942).
- "William Porcher Miles, Progressive Mayor of Charleston, 1855-1857," by Clarence McKittrick Smith, Jr., *ibid.*
- "Castle St. Mark and the Patriots of the Revolution," by Albert Mauncy and Alberta Johnson, in the *Florida Historical Quarterly* (July).

- "Spanish Contacts with the Ais (Indian River) Country," by Charles D. Higgs, *ibid.*
- "Some Plant Reminiscences of Southern Florida," by David Fairchild, in *Tequesta, The Journal of the Historical Association of Southern Florida* (August).
- "Henry Perrine, Pioneer Horticulturist of Florida," by T. Ralph Robinson, *ibid.*
- "Ceremonial Practices of the Modern Seminoles," by Robert F. Greenlee, *ibid.*
- "Food Plants of the DeSoto Expedition, 1539-1543," by Adin Baber, *ibid.*
- "The Administrative System in the Floridas, 1781-1821," by Duvon Clough Corbitt, *ibid.*
- "The Story of Ship Island, 1699-1941," by Margaret Roe Caraway, in the *Journal of Mississippi History* (April).
- "Battle Hill and St. Andrew's College," by Nash K. Burger, *ibid.*
- "Stagecoach Lines and Inns in Monroe County, Mississippi," by W. A. Evans, *ibid.* (July).
- "Breckinridge: An Arkansan at the Court of the Tsar," by Dorsey D. Jones, in the *Arkansas Historical Quarterly* (September).
- "The Attempt to Create a Republican Party in Arkansas during Reconstruction," by William A. Russ, Jr., *ibid.*
- "Arkansas in Territorial Days," by Marie Cash, *ibid.*
- "A Brief Biography of Prince Paul Wilhelm of Württemberg, (1797-1860)," with appended documents, by Louis C. Butscher, in the *New Mexico Historical Review* (July).
- "Sam Houston's Retreat," by William T. Riviere, in the *Southwestern Historical Quarterly* (July).
- "Life of General Don Manuel de Mier y Teran as It Affected Texas-Mexican Relations," by Ohland Morton, *ibid.*

DOCUMENTS AND COMPILATIONS ON THE STATES OF THE LOWER SOUTH

- "Dr. Anthony Cordes and Some of His Descendants," compiled by Emma B. Richardson, in the *South Carolina Historical and Genealogical Magazine* (July).
- "Marriage and Death Notices from the City Gazette of Charleston, S. C.," continued, contributed by Elizabeth H. Jervey, *ibid.*
- "The Journal of John Blake White," continued, edited by Paul R. Weidner, *ibid.*
- "Abstracts from Records of Court of Ordinary, 1764-1771," continued, contributed by Elizabeth H. Jervey, *ibid.*
- "Journal of General Peter Horry," continued, *ibid.*
- "Letters of James Warley Miles to David James McCord," contributed by J. H. Easterby, *ibid.*
- "Sources for South Carolina History in the Nation's Capital," by Maxcy Robson

Dickson, in the *Proceedings of the South Carolina Historical Association* (1942).

"Some Notes on the Descendants of Daniel Horry and Elizabeth Garnier Who Came to Carolina about 1692," edited by Katharine B. Mazýck, in the *Transactions of the Huguenot Society of South Carolina* (1942).

"Wills of South Carolina Huguenots," edited by Katharine B. Mazýck, *ibid.*

"From a Remote Frontier, Letters and Reports Passing Between the Commanders at Apalache (St. Marks), Governor Grant at St. Augustine, General Halde-
man at Pensacola, and General Gage, Commander-in-chief at New York,
1767-1769," continued, edited by Mark F. Boyd, in the *Florida Historical
Quarterly* (July).

"Florida Bibliography, 1941," compiled by Watt Marchman, in *Tequesta, The
Journal of the Historical Association of Southern Florida* (August).

"Traugott Bromme's *Mississippi: A Geographic-Statistic-Topographic Sketch for
Immigrants and Friends of Geography and Ethnology* (1837)," translated and
edited by Charles F. Heartman, in the *Journal of Mississippi History* (April).

"An Attala Boyhood," by Arthur Palmer Hudson, *ibid.*

"The Hunter Family," by Hattie Wooten H. Roberds, *ibid.* (July).

"An Attala Boyhood," continued, by Arthur Palmer Hudson, *ibid.*

"A Judicial View of Jackson, Mississippi, 1851-1853," edited by William D.
Hoyt, Jr., *ibid.*

"Henry M. Stanley in Arkansas and the Dixie Grays," in the *Arkansas Historical
Quarterly* (September).

"The Death of Nocona and the Recovery of Cynthia Ann Parker," edited by
Rupert N. Richardson, in the *Southwestern Historical Quarterly* (July).

"Bibliography of Tyler and Smith County," compiled by Hampson Gary, *ibid.*

"Spain's Indian Policy in Texas, Translations from the B  xar Archives," trans-
lated by J. Villasana Haggard, *ibid.*

"Dr. John Sibley and the Louisiana-Texas Frontier, 1803-1814," continued,
edited by Julia Kathryn Garrett, *ibid.*

GENERAL AND REGIONAL ARTICLES, DOCUMENTS, AND COMPILATIONS

"Writing and Research in Southern History," by Fletcher Melvin Green, in the
Proceedings of the South Carolina Historical Association (1942).

"General William Goldsmith Belknap, Commandant at Fort Gibson, Fort
Washita and Fort Smith," by Carolyn Thomas Foreman, in the *Chronicles of
Oklahoma* (June).

"British Depredations [*sic*] in the West Indies," by James Duncan Phillips, in
The Essex Institute Historical Collections (July).

"As to the State of Jamaica in 1707," by Frank J. Klingberg, in the *Journal of
Negro History* (July).

"The Jamaica Slave Insurrection Loan, 1832-1863," by Ronald V. Sires, *ibid.*

- "The Philadelphia Free Produce Attack Upon Slavery," by Norman B. Wilkinson, in the *Pennsylvania Magazine of History and Biography* (July).
- "The Role of the Land Speculator in Western Development," by Paul Wallace Gates, *ibid.*
- "The Psychological Background of the Election of 1860 in the South," by Ollinger Crenshaw, in the *North Carolina Historical Review* (July).
- "Lost Channels," by Sue Hetherington, in the *Missouri Historical Review* (July).
- "Galesburg: Hot-Bed of Abolitionism," by Hermann R. Muelder, in the *Journal of the Illinois State Historical Society* (September).
- "Early Settlers of the Rock River Valley," by Clyde E. Buckingham, *ibid.*

CONTRIBUTORS

WILLIAM O. LYNCH is professor emeritus of history at Indiana University.

ROBERT S. COTTERILL is professor of history at Florida State College for Women.

JAMES S. FERGUSON is engaged in research as a General Education Board fellow.

THOMAS P. GOVAN is assistant professor of history at the University of the South.

SUSIE M. AMES is associate professor of history at Randolph-Macon Woman's College.

CHARLES S. DAVIS, formerly associate professor of history at Alabama Polytechnic Institute, has been in the United States army since June and is now with the American Expeditionary Force overseas.

JOHN G. WESTOVER is a lieutenant in the United States army.

Books for Fall

Confederate Mississippi

By John K. Bettersworth

An intensive study of the political, economic, and social effects of war on a state of the Deep South. Mr. Bettersworth analyzes here the state's Civil War measures to solve its economic and political problems. The last chapters survey the ante-bellum cultural background of Mississippi and consider the effect of war upon the social and literary life of the state.

ABOUT 345 PAGES. ILLUSTRATED. READY NOVEMBER 1. \$3.00

With Sherman to the Sea

The Civil War Letters, Diaries, and Reminiscences
of Theodore F. Upson

Edited by Oscar O. Winther

This journal of a Union scout who fought with Sherman in his devastating "March to the Sea" is a close-up view of war—of weary marches, of the shock of battle, and of the hunger and pain experienced by men of the ranks.

The diary is at once a remarkable adventure story and a valuable contribution to Civil War history which reveals the impact of war upon a typical Western boy who enlisted to save the Union.

CLOTH. VI, 230 PAGES. 8VO. READY DECEMBER 1. \$2.25

LOUISIANA STATE UNIVERSITY PRESS
University Station, Baton Rouge, La.

THE HISPANIC AMERICAN HISTORICAL REVIEW

A quarterly dealing with the history of the
Latin American countries

JOHN TATE LANNING } EDITORS
ALAN K. MANCHESTER }

Contents of the August (1942) Issue

THE BARON DO RIO-BRANCO, JOAQUIM NABUCO,
AND THE GROWTH OF BRAZILIAN-AMERICAN
FRIENDSHIP, 1900-1910

Frederic William Ganzert

RUBBER RIVER: AN ACCOUNT OF THE RISE AND
COLLAPSE OF THE AMAZON BOOM

John Melby

THE *Guerra dos Emboabas*, CIVIL WAR IN
MINAS GERAIS, 1708-1709

Manoel S. Cardozo

FEUDAL AND CAPITALISTIC ELEMENTS IN THE
PORTUGUESE SETTLEMENT OF BRAZIL

Alexander Marchant

EXTRACTS FROM THE DIARY OF DOM PEDRO II

Mary Wilhelmine Williams

MATERIALS RELATING TO BRAZIL IN THE

NATIONAL ARCHIVES

Mary Wilhelmine Williams

BOOK REVIEWS

NOTES AND COMMENTS

BIBLIOGRAPHICAL SECTION

SUBSCRIPTION: \$4.00 A YEAR

DUKE UNIVERSITY PRESS
Durham, N. C.

VIRGINIA HISTORICAL SOCIETY

Organized 1831—Chartered 1834

JOSEPH D. EGGLESTON, PRESIDENT

Publishers of the

VIRGINIA MAGAZINE OF HISTORY AND BIOGRAPHY

The October, 1942, issue contains the following:

Footnotes upon Some XVII Century Virginians, by Francis Burton Harrison

"Maids for Wives," by Mrs. Henry Lowell Cook

Pamunkey Neck: The Birth of a Virginia County, by Elizabeth Hawes Ryland

Continental & State Troops of Virginia, edited by H. J. Eckenrode

"Harrican" in Colonial Virginia Records, by Charles Edgar Gilliam

A Chapter of English History for the English Children, by Mary Frances Goodwin

The English Ancestry of William Farrar (1594-c. 1637), contributed by Mrs. Henry Lowell Cook and Mrs. Louis C. Bulkley

Notes and Queries

Genealogy and Book Reviews

MEMBERSHIP DUES \$5.00 ANNUALLY

Magazine sent without additional charge to members.

Lee House, 707 East Franklin St.

RICHMOND, VA.

Editor and Corresponding Sec'y

CLAYTON TORRENCE

The Pacific Historical Review

Issued by the
Pacific Coast Branch
of the

American Historical Association

Articles, documents, book reviews, comments
and historical news on the entire Pacific area

BOARD OF EDITORS

Managing Editor: LOUIS KNOTT KOONTZ

Associate Editor: JOHN W. CAUGHEY

HAROLD W. BRADLEY

WILLIAM H. ELLISON

DAN E. CLARK

GEORGE P. HAMMOND

PETER M. DUNNE, S.J.

W. KAYE LAMB

Published in March, June, September, and December

Subscription rates: \$4.00 a year;

Canada, \$4.25; other countries, \$4.50

SPECIAL RATES TO STUDENTS

A sample copy will be sent on request

THE UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA PRESS

BERKELEY, CALIFORNIA

William and Mary College Quarterly

Devoted to the publication of original
contributions and documents
relating to Virginia history

\$1.00 A COPY \$4.00 A YEAR

THOROUGHLY INDEXED

Published Quarterly by

William and Mary College

at WILLIAMSBURG, VIRGINIA

Editors

JOHN STEWART BRYAN
President of William and
Mary College

E. G. SWEM
Librarian, William and
Mary College

AGRICULTURAL HISTORY

Designed as a medium for the publication of research and documents pertaining to the history of agriculture in all its phases and as a clearing house for information of interest and value to workers in the field. Materials on the history of agriculture in all countries are included and also material on institutions, organizations, and sciences which have been factors in agricultural development.

ISSUED QUARTERLY SINCE 1927

BY

THE AGRICULTURAL HISTORY SOCIETY

Subscriptions, including membership: Regular, \$3.00; Student, \$1.50; Contributing, \$1.00; Life, \$100 less age of applicant on last birthday.

Editor:
EVERETT E. EDWARDS

Secretary-Treasurer:
ARTHUR G. PETERSON

ROOM 3901, SOUTH BUILDING, 13TH AND C STREETS SW
WASHINGTON, D. C.

Tiberius and the Roman Empire

By

CHARLES EDWARD SMITH

The reign of Tiberius has engendered wide interest among students of the history of the Roman Empire. The author employs caution in using the Annals of Tacitus and the other traditional sources. The clear, interesting narrative is supplemented by critical notes that discuss in detail many of the more significant interpretative issues involved in the study.

CLOTH. VI, 281 PAGES.

\$2.75

LOUISIANA STATE UNIVERSITY PRESS
UNIVERSITY STATION • BATON ROUGE, LA.



THE TEXAS STATE HISTORICAL ASSOCIATION

1897—*The Oldest Learned Society in Texas*—1897

Offers in

THE SOUTHWESTERN HISTORICAL QUARTERLY

Articles, documents, comments, news notes, and book reviews
dealing with Texas and the Southwest

Managing Editor

WALTER PRESCOTT WEBB

Associate Editors

CHARLES W. HACKETT

RUDOLPH L. BIESELE

H. BAILEY CARROLL

Subscription rate: \$3.00 per year

Correspondence relating to contributions and subscriptions should be
addressed to the Managing Editor, University Station, Austin, Texas.

The Association also publishes

THE JUNIOR HISTORIAN

A literary and historical magazine by and for young people of
Junior High, Senior High, and Lower College levels. The first
magazine in America for young people also written almost
exclusively by them.

Editor

H. BAILEY CARROLL

Subscription rate: \$1.00 per school year.

Correspondence relating to *The Junior Historian* should be
addressed to the Editor, University Station, Austin, Texas.

THE SOUTHERN HISTORICAL ASSOCIATION

●

PRESIDENT

ALBERT B. MOORE, University of Alabama

VICE-PRESIDENT

J. G. DE ROULHAC HAMILTON, University of North Carolina

SECRETARY-TREASURER

JAMES W. PATTON, Converse College

EXECUTIVE COUNCIL

(In addition to the officers named above)

EX-PRESIDENTS

(For three years following expiration of their terms)

CHARLES S. SYDNOR, Duke University (1942)

FRANK L. OWSLEY, Vanderbilt University (1943)

BENJAMIN B. KENDRICK, Woman's College of the University of
North Carolina (1944)

MANAGING EDITOR

FRED C. COLE, Louisiana State University

ELECTED MEMBERS

MINNIE CLARE BOYD, Mississippi State College for Women (1942)

FLETCHER M. GREEN, University of North Carolina (1942)

OTTIS C. SKIPPER, Louisiana State Normal College (1943)

WILLIAM M. ROBINSON, JR., Jacksonville, Florida (1943)

WILLIAM C. BINKLEY, Vanderbilt University (1944)

BERNARD MAYO, University of Virginia (1944)